Nov. 18. 91.

Imprimatur,

Gabr. Quadring, Procan.

Jo. Beaumont,

Jo. Mountagu.

Jo. Spencer.

MICROFILMED—1976

Nov. 18. 91.

Imprimatur,

Gabr. Quadring, Procan.

Jo. Beaumont,

Jo. Mountagu.

Jo. Spencer.

MICROFILMED—1976

AN

ENQUIRY

INTO

Four Remarkable

TEXTS

OF THE

New Testament

Which contain

Some DIFFICULTY in them:

WITH A

Probable Resolution

Of them.

By *John Edwards* B. D. sometime Fellow of St *Johns* College in *Cambridge*.

1 Cor. 13. 9. *We know in part, and we prophesie in part.*

CAMBRIDGE,

Printed by *J. Hayes*, Printer to the University; for *W. Graves* Bookseller there. 1692.

AN

ENQUIRY

INTO

The TEXTS Enquired into and Resolved are,

Matth. II. 23.

He shall be called a Nazarene.

1 Corinth. XI. 14.

Doth not even Nature it self teach you, that if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?

1 Corinth. XV. 29.

Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?

1 Peter III. 19.

By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, &c.

CAMBRIDGE,

Printed by J. Hayes, Printer to the University; for W. Graves Bookseller there. 1692.

THE PREFACE.

THat there are Obſcurities *and* Difficulties *in Holy Writ is acknowledged by all perſons that are converſant in this Sacred Volume. And truly, if we conſider things aright, we ſhall find that this is not unworthy either of* God *or of his* Holy Word. *Not of* God *himſelf who endited the Sacred Scriptures, for he hath moſt Wiſely ordered that there ſhould be ſome things Obſcure and Myſterious in them, to create a becoming Reverence, and to let us know that theſe Writings are not penned after an ordinary manner. Theſe Clouds and Darkneſs are ſuitable to the Majeſty of Heaven, they are proper to beget in us Humility, and Mean Thoughts of our ſelves, to convince us of the Shallowneſs of our Intellects, to ſhew us how Short-ſighted we are, to give check to our Preſumption, to quaſh our towring Conceits of our knowledge, to ſuperſede our Vain Boaſting, to repel our Vaunting Pride and Inſolence. They are ſerviceable alſo to rebuke our Sloth and Negligence, to provoke our Care and Study, and to excite our utmoſt Diligence. Thus it hath pleaſed God to exerciſe the* Underſtandings *of*

men, and to make trial of their Industry by these Difficult passages which occurre in Scripture. If all places were easy, this Book would be liable to Contempt, and there would be no room left for our Diligent Search and Enquiry. But now at every reading of it we still find something to employ our understandings afresh, and to improve our most inquisitive faculties. Here our minds may be perpetually busied, here is enough to entertain our greatest leisure and most earnest study. Here are many Mysteries to be unfolded, many Depths to be fathomed, many Abstrusities (both in the things and in the words that convey the notice of them to our minds) to be discovered: so that to the Greatest Student and most Ambitious Enquirer, that will happen which the Son of Sirach saith in another case, When a man hath done, then he beginneth. Here are not only Foords and Shallows which we may easily wade through, but here are unpassable Depths and Abysses. It hath seemed good to the Wise Governor of the world that there should be in the Holy Scripture Some things hard to be understood (as S. Peter particularly pronounceth of S. Pauls Epistles,) that hereby the Excellency of these Sacred Writings might appear, that by this means it might be seen of what Universal use they are: for those places which are plain and clear are fitted to ordinary capacities, and those other portions which are deep and intricate are the proper entertainment of the Learned, and they the Whole

Book is calculated for the general benefit of all. * S' Chrysostom *hath summ'd it up thus very briefly,* All passages in Scripture are not plain and perspicuous lest we should be Lazy, nor are all obscure lest we should Despond. *This Excellent* Tempering *of the Sacred Writ is a high commendation of it, and is no other then the Wise Contrivance of Heaven.*

* Διὰ τοῦτο οὔτε σαφῆ πάντα ἐστὶν, ἵνα μὴ ῥαθυμήσῃς, οὔτε ἀσαφῆ, ἵνα μὴ ἀπογνῶς. Hom. 36. in 1. ad Corinth.

And as this Obscurity of some parts of Scripture is not unworthy of God himself, *so neither is it any disparagement to his* Sacred Word. *For we must know that this Difficulty happens from the very nature of the things themselves which are here recorded. It cannot be otherwise but that some portions of Scripture must be dark and obscure, and consequently must labour under Different and Contrary Expositions, because they were written so long ago, and contain in them so many* Old Customs *and* Usages, *so many* Relations concerning Different People, *so many and various* Idioms of Tongues, *such diversity of* Antient Expressions, Laws, *and* Manners of all Nations in the world. *It is unreasonable to expect that we should exactly understand all these. It is not to be wondred at that these occasion Doubts, Difficulties, Mistakes. And it is certain that the being ignorant of some of these is no blemish either to the Sacred Writings, or to the persons who read and study them.*

Suppoſe I do not know what the houſe of Aſuppim *is*, 1 Chron. 26. 15. *or what kind of trees the* Almug *or* Algum-trees *are*, 1 Kings 10. 12. 1 Chron. 20. 8. *or who are meant by the* Gammadim, Ezek. 27. 11. *What though I am not ſo well skill'd in the Jewiſh Modes and Faſhions, as to tell what kind of Womens-Ornament* the houſes of the ſoul *are, in* Iſai. 3. 20. *or what particular Idols or Pagan Deities* Gad *and* Meni *are*, Iſai. 65. 11. *or which of the Heathen Gods is meant by* Chiun *or* Remphan, Amos 5. 26. Acts 7. 43. *Some of the Learneſt Expoſitors and Criticks have confeſſed their ignorance as to theſe places of Scripture: particularly upon the laſt of them our Profound Antiquary hath theſe deſpairing words,* *For my part I perceive my blindneſs to be ſuch that I can ſee nothing at all. *And to the ſame purpoſe this Admirable Perſon ſpeaks concerning ſeveral other paſſages in Scripture, as of* Niſhroc, Nergal, *and other Idols mentioned there, the origine and meaning of which Names are hid from us. Many other Reaſons might be alledged of the real or ſeeming Difficulty of ſome places, namely the Sublimity of the Matter, the Ambiguity and Different Significations of the Words, the Inadvertency of Expoſitors, and ſometimes their unskilfulneſs, and oftentimes their Willful Deſigning to pervert the words, in order to the maintaining ſome opi-*

* *Me tam cæcutire ſentio ut nihil omnino videam.* Selden de Dis Syr. Syntag. 2. c. 14.

nions or practiſes which they adhere to. But no man of a ſedate mind and reaſon can think that the Scriptures themſelves are diſparaged by theſe Difficulties and Miſtakes, for they are not arguments of the Scriptures *Imperfection, but of* Man's. *Beſides, theſe Obſcurities which are accompanied with the various ways of rendring ſome Expreſſions, and determining the Senſe, are no proof of the Imperfection of this Holy Book, becauſe in matters of Faith and Manners, which are the Main things we are concerned in, and for which the Bible was chiefly writ, theſe Writings are plain and intelligible. All Neceſſary and Fundamental Points of Religion are ſet down here in ſuch expreſſions as are ſuitable to the capacities of the moſt ſimple and vulgar. God hath graciouſly condeſcended to the infirmities of the meaneſt and moſt unlearned, by ſpeaking to them in theſe Writings after the manner of Men, and by propounding the greateſt Myſteries in a Familiar ſtile and way. The Scripture, ſo far as it relates to our belief and Practice, is very eaſie and plain, yea much plainer then the Gloſſes and Comments upon it oftentimes are. In a word, moſt of the places of Scripture call not for an Interpreter, but a Practiſer, As for other paſſages, which are Obſcure and Intricate (but which are very few in reſpect of thoſe that are plain,) they were deſigned (as hath been already ſuggeſted) to employ our more inquiſitive and elaborate thoughts, and to whet our induſtry in the ſtudying of this Ho-*

ly Volume; that at last, when we have the happiness of retrieving the lost sense of the words, and restoring them to their genuine meaning, we may the more prize our acquest which hath cost us some pains. Or, if after all our attempts we cannot reach the true meaning, we have reason to entertain reverend thoughts of those Difficult Texts of Scripture, and to perswade ourselves that they are worthy of the Divine Enditer, though our weak minds cannot comprehend them. If Humane Authors delight to darken their writings sometimes, and it is accounted no blemish, surely we may conclude that the Mysteries of the Sacred and Inspired Stile are rather an inhancement then a diminution of its Excellency. Shall we not think it fit to deal as fairly with the Sacred Code *as* Socrates *did with* Heraclitus's *writings, that is, not only pronounce so much as we understand of them to be Excellent and Admirable, but believe also that what we do not understand is so too? It is certainly an undeniable truth, that neither the Wisdom of God nor the Credit of this Inspired Book are empaired by any Difficulties we find in it. Therefore when the men of the Roman perswasion make use of these Hard places in the Bible to disparage and discredit it, and to render the Scriptures useless as to the common people, questionless they take a wrong course: first they complain that these Writings are Obscure, and then they make them more so by locking them up from the sight of the people; whereas they should rather expose them to light, and indeavour to remove the obscurity by expounding them.* This

This is that which I have done in this Critical Eſſay which I here venture into the world: of which it may be expected I ſhould give ſome brief Account; therefore take it thus, In my firſt Attempt, viz. *on thoſe words,* [He ſhall be called a Nazarene,] *I reject (but not without ſhewing my Reaſons) the moſt generally received Interpretations, and offer another, namely that by* a Nazarene *is meant* one of the city Nazareth, *an Inhabitant of that place: and by the* Prophets *that foretold this, I underſtand ſome Inſpired perſons who prediƈted that our Saviour ſhould dwell and converſe at* Nazareth: *and this their Prediction was delivered from one to another till it came to* St Matthew, *who here ſets it down in writing. Therefore let it not ſtartle the Reader that I ſay in my Diſcourſe on theſe words,* There was ſuch a Report or Tradition *in this Evangeliſt's days: for though this is but a Conjecture, yet it is a very Probable one, I ſhewing that the Apoſtles* St Paul *and* St Jude *made uſe of the like* Reports *and* Traditions, *and inſerted them into their Writings. Wherefore it is not unlikely that the Evangeliſt here refers to a Tradition which was at that time concerning Chriſt's being a* Nazarene, *i. e. that he ſhould be one of the city* Nazareth. *But becauſe this is only Probable, I advance farther, and prove that this was not only ſpoken by ſome* Uncertain *and* Unknown Prophets, *and ſo conveyed to the Jews, but that it was likewiſe foretold by thoſe very* Prophets *who were the* Penmen of the Holy Scripture; *and accordingly*

dingly I proceed to prove that these Writers directly predicted Christ's being related to the place called Nazareth, *and his having his denomination thence,* (*for* he was brought up there, *Luke* 4. 16. *and therefore it is called* his Country, 23 *v.*) *and lastly I make it evident that this was actually fulfilled and accomplished in the plain and obvious meaning of the words,* viz. *that* he was called a Nazarene, *i e. One of* Nazareth: *he was reproached for being an Inhabitant of that place, and that not only by the* Gentiles, *but by the very* Jews, *for the* Galilæans, *of whom the people of* Nazareth *were a part, were of Pagan extraction, as the* Samaritans *were: they were both of them looked upon by the grand body of the* Jews *as* no Jews *properly, a kind of barbarous people in comparison of themselves and other inhabitants of* Judea.

In my Exposition of the Second Text, which is this, Doth not nature it self teach you, that if a man hath long hair, it is a shame to him? *I take the words* φύσις & κομᾶν *in the largest extent,* i e. *I consider the former, as it signifies* Custom, *and the* Law of Natural Reason, *and* the Distinction of the Sexes; *and the latter, as it denotes both the* Length *and the* Decking *of the hair, and accordingly I make it my business first to prove, that if a Man either indulgeth an Immoderate Length of hair, or is sollicitous about the Composing and Adorning of it, he acts contrary to the* Custom *of the sobereſt part of mankind, whether they be* Jews, Egyptians, Arabians, Gre-

Grecians, Romans, &c. (*all whose practise in this case I have represented from those Authors who treat of the manners of those people.*) *If it shall be objected, that there was a* Different and Contrary Custom *as to these things, I grant it, and yet this is no prejudice to what I maintain, for the Apostle without doubt means the Custom and Usage of the better and wiser part of mankind, and not of the worst. Then, in the next place, I demonstrate this to be disagreeable to the laws and rules of* Reason, *which I explain in several Particulars. Afterwards, I shew it to be against the established* Law of the Sexes, *whereby one of them is distinguished from the other. So that taking the words in this Latitude, the meaning of the Apostle in them is this, That a Christian man should not do things repugnant to any of these three Rules,* viz. *Laudable Custom, Reason, and the Law which is proper to each Sex; and that he that wears his hair of an Immoderate Length, or after the guise of Women, offends against all these Rules. If any one object against the Latitude of this Exposition, I answer, that I take this for an allowed Verity, that when we meet with words in any place of Scripture which have different senses, and those senses are not inconsistent with one another, we may lawfully take them all into the meaning of the Text; and that is it which I do here, and thereby render the meaning of the words full and entire. However, take the words which way you will, and if you pitch upon any Particular Sense, I hope I have suggested that which will give light to it.*

I

I here adjoyn something concerning the Custom of Covering *and* Uncovering *the head among the different People and Nations of the world. The summ of what I say is, that the* Eastern *people went always with their heads covered, and the* Greeks *were always uncovered, but the* Romans *took a middle way, for they thought they were bound as to this matter to distinguish between the times of* Worship *and of* Common Conversation, *and that the behaviour which was used in the one ought to be different from that of the other. Accordingly they always covered their heads in the time of Worshipping: from whence (as well as from what is recorded of them) we may gather that their practice was contrary when they were about their ordinary business, that is, that they were* Uncovered. *But from the* Jews *covering their heads when they worship'd, we cannot infer that they did not do so at other times, and the reason is because they made no distinction at all between one time and the other as to this behaviour. Only, I desire the Reader (that he may not misinterpret me) to distinguish between the* Ancient Romans *and those that came* after them, *for as to this usage (as well as to some others) these two exceedingly differed from one another: yea, the* Latter Romans *were strangely enclined to shift their customs, and differ'd from Themselves as well as the* Old Romans, *as I have shew'd. This I thought fit to mention here, lest any man should mistake me and the Truth it self. I have added something likewise concerning*

the

the Custom of the Other Sex, *and there you'l find that there is no Variation at all: the Women of all Nations generally cover'd their heads when they were abroad, and the Apostle is not willing they should lay aside so Laudable and Catholick an usage.*

In my Third Undertaking, which is an interpretation of those so much controverted words, What shall they do that are baptized for the dead? *I recite the various opinions of Authors concerning the meaning of this place: not that I delight to muster up whole Armies of Writers; some Antient and some Modern, some at home, others abroad, but because the present affair requires it. There being several Expositions of these words, it was necessary to acquaint you with them before I offer'd that which I conceive to be the true and genuine sense of the Apostle. Accordingly, after I have rejected the interpretations of Others on the place, and have all along given you the Reasons why I do so, I at last expose my own sentiments in a plain and easie interpretation, such as every one may see is the genuine import of the words, viz. that* to be baptized for the dead, *is no other then to be baptized* because of the dead, *or* for the sake of the dead, *i. e. of those Holy Martyrs who lay'd down their lives for Christ and his Blessed Cause. The courage and bravery which these shew'd at their death did effectually invite great numbers of Infidels, who took notice of their Christian behaviour, to lay aside their false and idolatrous religion, and to imbrace the Faith of Christ, and to desire to be admitted mem-*

bers of the Church by Baptism. By reason of the admirable carriage of those dying Martyrs, there were Converts daily gained to Christianity: many Jews and Pagans were stirred up to own the same Holy Religion which they saw them defend so undauntedly. This made them eager of being baptized. This I take to be the plain meaning of their being baptized for the dead, *i. e. they were baptized, and became Christians for the sake and on the account of those deceased Saints who they saw attested the truth of Christianity with their bloud. How probable this Interpretation is, yea how preferable to all others, I hope I have convinced the Reader in the Discourse it self, to which I remit him.*

In my Last Effort, where I undertake to shew who are the spirits in prison to whom Christ preached, *I do (as before) enumerate the several Glosses which have been made upon the words. Some have fetch'd the sense of them from Heaven, others from Hell, and some from a Middle place (as they fancy) between both: and many others have presented us with their Conjectures on this Text. But when I have discovered the invalidity of them, I proceed to let you see what Other more true account may be given of the words. And that is this, Christ by his Spirit in his Apostles and Ministers preached the Gospel to* Sinners (*and to whom else should he preach it?*) *to Unconverted and Unregenerate persons, whether Jews or Gentiles: and hereby many of them were converted to the faith, and were saved. This is the plain sense*

of

of this Text, which hath been so differently handled by Protestants and Papists: and this interpretation (as I think I have made it evident, but the Reader is to judge) is conformable to the scope of the Context, suitable to the Phrase and Language both of the Old and New Testament, and most agreeable to the Thing it self which is here represented by the Apostle. For there could not be a more Easie, and yet a more Significant expression to set forth the state of men in their sins *then This of the* spirits in prison. *Those persons are, in a Religious and Spiritual way of speaking (which is the constant stile of the Holy Ghost in the writings of the Prophets and Apostles)* Prisoners *and* Bondmen *shut up in a miserable Durance*: they sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, being bound in affliction and iron, *as the Psalmist describes* Poor Captives, *Psal.* 107. 10. *This is a plain and obvious Metaphor, and at the very first propounding of it we are able to apprehend its meaning. Poor distressed souls that are under the bondage of sin and vice, are* spirits in prison, *but the Blessed Jesus* cometh and preacheth to them *by the Ministry of his Apostles and servants, and thereby* brings them out of darkness, and the shadow of death, and breaks their bonds in Sunder, *as the same Divine Poet speaks in that place. Certainly then* St Peter (*who had been a* * Prisoner *and* bound with chains, *and knew the hardships and misery of this sort of men*) *could not have made choice of any Similitude, could not have used any Expression where-*

* Act. 12. 16.

by

by it was possible to give us a more Compendious Character, a more Lively and Natural Idea of the Deplorable Condition of Unconverted Sinners, then this here doth. Which makes it somewhat strange that such multitudes of Expositors and Commentators have not taken notice of it, but have rather chosen to give us some farfetched and strained interpretations of these words.

This is the short Account which I thought good to premise before the following Exercitations. In this whole I hope I have faithfully discharged my task: this I am sure of, that I have not wilfully made any false steps. I have been very fair, and have used no violence upon the words, as it is the too common practice of Criticks. They are people that rack their Fancies and the Texts together, they stretch and screw the words, they teaze and worry, they torment and most unmercifully force and drag a Text to their side. You may observe it, an errant Critick is a Resolute sort of man generally, he is very Earnest in his work, though in never so light a matter, and pushes it on to the utmost extremity. I could mention several Professors of Criticism who are guilty of this miscarriage, who make it their business to force their way. You shall see them set down before a Text, and raise their Batteries against it, and play their Cannon and Mortars upon it. If this will not do, they come with greater force, and make a fresh assault with stronger Detachments from Poets, Orators, Historians, Philosophers &c. and fall on with greater fu-

ry,

ry, thinking by this means to bring it to a Parly, and then a Surrender: or rather, by their furious attacks we may guess they intend no other thing then to take it by Storm. And truly in this Imaginary Romantick Adventure they think they have done it, they perswade themselves they have taken possession of the Fort, and so the Campaigne is at an end, and there is a period to their doughty attempts. But I hate these Violent courses, this besieging of a Chapter and Verse, this investing of a Place of Scripture. I abhor the common practise of ravaging and preying upon the Bible: I do not like the Bombarding of Scripture, I approve not of the Storming of a Text, and taking it by force. It is a very unchristian and unbecoming employment to extort a sense from any place of Holy Writ, and by little Critical arts and fetches to bring over the words to a compliance with us, i.e. to the meaning which we design. Indeed this (however it may be represented as a Mighty Work) is easily done by the aides of a Ready Invention, a Luxuriant Pen, and a shew of some Reason and Argument, especially if these be back'd with a strong Desire of venting some New Notion in the world. But then I do not think that the man believes the thing himself after all his flippant Rhetorick and strained Logick: which methinks should make him very uneasie and much dissatisfied, for how can one offer that to others to be believed, which he gives no credit to himself? For my part, I love first to satisfie my self about any Point, before I design to expose it to others judgments: and this

I have done in the Present Undertaking, otherwise I should think I had dealt very uncivilly (to say no worse) with the world. I have offer'd that upon These Texts which I conceived to be most Credible, which I found to have the warranty of Reason or some Good Probability. I am not conscious of any unhandsome and unjust dealing with the words which I have made the subject of my Discourses. I have not set any of the Texts upon the Rack, I have not put them to the Torture to confess what they never intended. I have let them speak freely and unconstrainedly: and then you may expect no other then Truth and Realities. If Others have different conceptions concerning these places of Scripture, I am not offended in the least. I have offered the Reasons of my assertions: let them shew theirs, and then perhaps there will be no disagreement. However, my purpose is to be Friendly and Peaceable, and I desire to treat all Writers with a due respect and deference, though I cannot comply with them in every thing that they assert.

To conclude, let all our Enquiries and Disputes about these Scripture-Difficulties, *be unfeignedly designed and refer'd to the Glory of the Supreme Eternal Being, to the advancement of our Knowledge in the Inspired Writings, to the enlightning our minds in the True Religion, to the edification of the Church, and the advantage of the Christian world.*

The

The first TEXT Enquired into, *viz.*

S. Matthew II. 23.

He shall be called a Nazarene.

THOUGH the Practical part of Christian Theology be infinitely more noble, more excellent, more usefull then either the mere Speculative or Polemical parts of it; though the Easiest and Plainest matters of our Religion be of the greatest importance to us; and consequently though those places of Holy Scripture which are most Intelligible and Practical, and contain in them the necessary duties relating to Faith and Manners be our chiefest concern, yet it is certain that the other parts of this Holy Book, even those which are Obscure and Controverted, are not unworthy of our thoughts and studies. Yea, These carrying some *Difficulty* with them, may on that

very account justly call for our more serious disquisitions, and challenge our more intent enquiries. Questionlesse the explaining the Difficult passages of Holy Writ is not only a very Entertaining and Delightfull undertaking, but such a one as will prove extremely Advantageous to the Christian Church, if it be performed aright. By this means we shall first be brought to admire and adore, and then to apprehend the profound Mysteries of the Bible; we shall learn by degrees to fathom its Vast Depths, we shall be invited to search yet Farther into its hidden Treasures and so at last to arrive to Greater and Larger Measures of that Divine Knowledge, which, next unto the Practise of Religion, is the most worthy accomplishment of a Christian mans life. For these reasons I will attempt to make an Enquiry into, and then to offer the Resolution of some Obscure and Difficult Texts which we meet with in the Writings of the New Testament.

I Begin first with this Notable passage in the Evangelist St *Matthew*, with which he closeth his second Chapter, *He shall be called a Nazarene*. There were two ways of interpreting this of old: First,

First, [a] *Tertullian* and [b] *Eusebius*, and some other Ancient Fathers thought it was an allusion to the *Nazarites*, a Religious and separate rank of persons among the *Jews* spoken of in the Old Testament. And more particularly, St *Jerom* on the place tells us that [c] a *Nazarene* here is to be interpreted a *Holy person*, and that it is mentioned throughout all the Writings of the Old Testament that the *Messias*, our *Lord Christ*, was to be such, and consequently that it might well and truly be said that the *Prophets* foretold concerning him, that *he should be called a Nazarene*, i. e. *a Holy Nazarite*. The second way of interpreting these words among the Antients was this, that they have reference to those places where Christ is called *Netzer*, a *Branch*, as in *Isai.* 11 1. & 60. 21. yea, St *Jerom* himself, who seem'd to have fixed on the former way of Interpretation, is enclined to think that this Prophecy [d] was taken out of the first verse of the Eleventh chapter of *Isaiah*, and such like places that

[a] *Adv. Marcion. l.* 4.

[b] *Demonstr. Evang. l.* 7. *c.* 1.

[c] Nazarenus *Sanctus interpretatur: Sanctum autem Dominum futurum omnis Scriptura commemorat.*

[d] *Illud quod in Evangelio Matthei omnes quærunt Ecclesiastici, & non inveniunt ubi scriptum sit* [quoniam Nazarenus vocabitur] *eruditi Hebræorum de hoc loco assumptum putant. Hieron. Comment. in Esai. cap.* 11. *v.* 1. and again, *Possumus & aliter dicere quod etiam iisdem verbis juxta Hebraicam veritatem in Esaiâ scriptum sit* [Et exiet virga de radice &c.] *Comment. in Matth. cap.* 2. *v.* 23.

ſpeak of the *Branch*. Theſe were the Two Opinions *of old* concerning this Text, and they have been taken up by *Modern* Expoſitors both of the Church of *Rome* and of the Reformed perſwaſion. Among theſe latter are *Grotius* and *Hammond* (to name no more,) the firſt whereof merits that Title which the Greeks gave *Alexander Aphrodiſæus*, the Antienteſt Commentator on *Ariſtotle, viz.* ὁ Ἐξηγητὴς, *the Interpreter*, by way of Eminency. For certainly no man hath excell'd him in giving the Literall ſenſe and interpretation of Scripture. For this he is Incomparable, and ſpeaks more Good Senſe in one line then ſome others in a dozen long Periods. The ſecond of theſe Modern Expoſitors is our Countryman, one of the Greateſt Divines and Criticks of this laſt Age, a perſon of equal Learning and Piety, and therefore worthy to be (what he moſt Eminently was) a Son, or rather one of the Fathers of the Church of *England*. The former of theſe Excellent Writers refers Ναζωραῖος to the word *Nazar ſeperavit*, whence the *Nazarites* are ſtiled, and ſo Chriſt (ſaith he) was foretold in the Old Teſtament to be an Abſtinent Mortified perſon, a True

Nazarite,

Nazarite. The ſecond refers the word *Nazarene* to that ſacred and venerable title of נצר *the Branch* often applied to the *Meſſias*, and thinks that our Evangeliſt ſpeaks of this here.

But I cannot Subſcribe to either of theſe Excellent Perſons in what they offer concerning the meaning of this word *Nazarene*. It is my perſwaſion that neither of theſe references were intended by the Evangeliſt, and my reaſon is this, becauſe they are nothing at all to the purpoſe. Mark how the words are brought in, *He came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth, that it might be fulfilled which was ſpoken by the Prophets, He ſhall be called a Nazarene*. Is it not plain to any common underſtanding that *Nazarene* refers to *Nazareth*, and that Chriſt ſhould be *called the former* becauſe *he dwelt in the latter*? Certainly there can be nothing more evident then this, and therefore it is impertinent here to talk of his being *Netzer the Branch* ſpoken of in the Old Teſtament, or of his being a *Nazarite*, which is no where ſaid of him. Or, if he were a *Nazarite* in any ſenſe (as *Nazar* may ſignifie a Holy Separate perſon, as our Learned *Lightfoot*, and before him *Beza* and

Heinſius have obſerved on this place) yet this is nothing to the purpoſe, becauſe that word hath no reference at all to the *city Nazareth*, which is here ſpoken of. I have therefore ſometimes wondred that very Learned men have contented themſelves with theſe Impertinent Notions, and that they could prevail with themſelves to think that either of theſe were the true meaning of the place. Can any man reconcile this to ſenſe that the places in the Old Teſtament which foretell of *Chriſt* as the *Branch*, or as a *Nazarite*, (if there were any ſuch thing) were fullfilled in his dwelling in a town call'd *Nazareth*? Can any man of any accuracy of reaſon ſee the Accompliſhment of the one in the other, or find any Affinity between theſe? But now if we take [*a Nazarene*] for *one of the city Nazareth, or one that dwelt at Nazareth*, the words are plain and eaſily underſtood, and any one may ſee the Fulfilling of the Prophecy here ſpoken of. This then is that which I offer as my ſentiment concerning this Controverted Text, *viz.* that neither Chriſt being called *Netzar*, nor his being in any ſenſe a *Nazarite* are ſo much as to be thought of in this place, becauſe they are wholly imper-

impertinent and foreign here: but the true, genuine, and unforc'd meaning of the place is, that it was foretold of old by the Prophets that our Saviour *ſhould be called a Nazarene*, i. e. *a man of Nazareth*, and accordingly when *he came and dwelt in the city called Nazareth*, that which was thus *ſpoken by the Prophets was fulfilled.* Here is no ſtraining of the words, here is no need of far fetched Criticiſms, but the ſenſe of the Text is facile and obvious, and he that runs may read it and underſtand it.

But you will ask, where is it foretold that he ſhall be call'd a *Nazarene*, i. e. one of *Nazareth*? Here then is the greateſt *Difficulty* (if it may be called ſo) to prove that this was Propheſied concerning Chriſt Or rather, there are theſe two things to be proved before I can hope to gain the Readers aſſent to what I have offered: Firſt I muſt make it appear that this was foretold by the Prophets, *viz.* that Chriſt *ſhould be call'd a Nazarene*, i, e. a man of *Nazareth*; and Secondly I am obliged to ſhew that *he actually was called ſo.* Both theſe are very Evident, in ſo much that I cannot but wonder again that Expoſitors have overlooked a thing which

is so plain and obvious. First, it was foretold that our Saviour should bear the Name of a *Nazarene*, and that first as it is *a Name referring to a Place*, and secondly as it is *a Name of Reproach*, taken from his inhabiting in such a place.

First, it was foretold as a Name derived from a Place, as it denoteth our Saviour to be *one of Nazareth*. But you will ask, where doth any *Prophet* say that he shall be an *Inhabitant of Nazareth*? I answer, This is not the very thing which the Text asserts: and the observing of it will lead us to the right understanding of the words. It is not said *it was spoken by one particular Prophet, but by the Prophets*: by whom may be understood not only those that were the Penmen of the S. Scripture (of whom afterwards) but others of a like Prophetick spirit, who used to foretell the Coming of the *Messias*, and particularly to assign the Place of his generall *Abode*, as well as that of his *Birth* and *Crucifixion*. And therefore though we find not in the Sacred Writings these express termes [*He shall be called a Nazarene*,] i. e. *he shall be*, and *be called One of Nazareth*, yet St *Matthew's* words are true, *that this was spoken by the Prophets*,

Prophets, for it was the General Saying among them, when the *Jews* enquired of them where the *Messias's habitation* should be the greatest part of his life, that it should be at *Nazareth*, a Town in *Galilee*. This was a Received Report among the *Jews*, and passed for a Prophetick Saying, and thence the Evangelist makes use of it, and applies it here very appositely when he was relating how *Joseph being warned of God turned aside into the parts of Galilee, and came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth*. This, saith he, was *spoken* of long before by the *Prophets*, by the Holy Men that discoursed of the *Messias* his Coming, and we have received it from them. For without doubt they had many things delivered to them from the mouths of Prophetick persons, which were transmitted from age to age. Thus we find St *Jude* quotes *Enochs Propheey*, which he had only by Tradition, *Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his Saints*, v. 14. And St *Paul* makes mention of the *Egyptian* Sorcerers *Jannes* and *Jambres*, 2 *Tim.* 3. 8, whose Names are not found in *Exodus*, but were taken out of the Traditions of the Jews. In like manner our Evangelist quotes

quotes that here which was reported to have been ſaid by certain *Prophets* of old, whoſe Predictions were delivered from one to another. It is not improbable that St *Matthew* had by Tradition ſuch a *Prophecy* as in expreſs ſyllables foretold that our Saviour ſhould *be called a Nazarene*, i. e. he ſhould have his Name from *Nazareth*, the place where he was to dwell, for 'tis very likely that This, no leſs then the Place of his Nativity, *Bethlehem*, was predicted by ſome Inſpired and Prophetick men.

The next thing I am to prove is that this Prophetick Rumour which prevailed among the Jews was *actually fulfilled*, i. e. that our Bleſſed Maſter *was called a Nazarene*, or *one of Nazareth*, as that Name hath reference to the place of his Habitation. It cannot eſcape our obſervation that it is particularly recorded, and that ſundry times, not only in the *four Goſpels* but in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, that Chriſt *was called Jeſus of Nazareth*, and that this was a Name given him by all ſorts of perſons. He was called ſo by the *Multitude*. *Luke* 18. 37, and more Expreſly and Emphatically in *Mat.* 21. 11. *This* (ſay they) *is Jeſus the prophet of Nazareth of Galilee*: he had

had this Name given him by his *Friends* and *Followers*, by his *Apoſtles* and *Diſciples*, as you read in *Luke* 24. 19. *John* 1. 45. *Acts* 2. 22. & 4. 10. & 10. 38. & 26. 9. The ſame Name was attributed to him by his profeſſed *Enemies*, *Mark* 14. 67. *John* 18. 5. *Acts* 6. 14. and more eſpecially by *Pilate* his Judge, who fixed this Title on the Croſſe, *Jeſus of Nazareth King of the Jews*, *John* 19. 19. and as for the other Titles ſet over him, mentioned by the reſt of the Evangeliſts, they were but Abbreviatures of this. Obſerve farther that the *Angels* of heaven called him by this Name, *Mark* 16. 6. and ſo did the *Devils*, *Mark* 1. 23. *Luke* 4. 34. Laſtly, he is thus Named by *Himſelf*, *Acts* 22. 8. where we find that even from Heaven he was pleaſed to own this Title; *I am Jeſus of Nazareth*, ſaith he to the furious *Saul*. Now, is not this very remarkable, and much to our preſent purpoſe, that *his being of Nazareth* conſtantly gave the *Denomination* to him? He hath his Name from no other place, unleſs it be from *Galilee*, *Mat.* 21. 11. and *Nazareth* was part of that *Galilee*, ſo that in a manner it was the ſame Name. *He ſhall be called a Nazarene*, ſaid

ſaid the Prophets; and behold, he was ſo. In *Nazareth* he was bred up, and thence he had his *Name*: which you ſee is moſt particularly and ſignally taken notice of in the Evangelical Writings; as it were to tell us that the Prophecy concerning this Name of Chriſt was really fulfilled.

We have now paſſed the *Boine*, we have overcome that Great Difficulty (for ſo it was thought by ſome, and looked upon as inſuperable) *viz.* the proving that Chriſt's *being called a Nazarene* (i. e. *one of Nazareth*) was in that very notion and ſenſe both foretold and fulfilled. Let us now proceed to Vanquiſh this ſeeming Difficulty by Other Arguments. Secondly then, we are to conſider *this Name* as it is *a Name of Reproach*, and ſo I ſhall ſhew that it was foretold by the Prophets, even the very *Prophets* who were *Penmen of the Old Teſtament* that our Lord ſhould be called by this Name, and likewiſe that he was ſo called in way of Reproach. The firſt of theſe is to be proved only in a *general way* from the Old Teſtament, where it is often declared that Holy and Righteous perſons ſhall meet with Reproachfull words from the mouths

of

of wicked men, that it is their uſuall lot in this world to ſuffer in their Names and Reputations, to be ſcoffed at and defamed by that ſort of people, and to be repreſented as perſons loathed and forſaken by the Divine *Numen*. More particularly of our *Saviour* 'tis ſaid that he ſhall be a Deſpiſed and Contemptible perſon in the eyes of men. *I am a worm and no man, a reproach of men, and deſpiſed of the People. All they that ſee me laugh me to ſcorn, they ſhoot out the lip, they ſhake the head*, &c. *Pſal.* 22. 6, 7. And again, *For thy ſake I have born reproach, ſhame hath covered my face*, *Pſal.* 69. 7. *The reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me*, v. 9. *They that ſit in the gate ſpeak againſt me*, v. 12. It is univerſally granted that *David* was a Type of *Chriſt*, and what he here ſaith is ſpoken alſo of Him whoſe Repreſentative he was. This no man who is acquainted with the Bible, and the genius of it, will ſo much as think of denying; yea, he will acknowledge that that whole 22th *Pſalm* is more eſpecially and peculiarly applicable to our Saviour, and 'tis certain that he rehearſed either all or part of it when he hung on the Croſſe. Of this

Deſpiſed

Deſpiſed Jeſus ſpeaks that Evangelicall Prophet, *His viſage was marred more then any man, and his form more than the Sons of men, Iſai.* 52. 14. *He hath no form nor comelineſſe: and when they ſhall ſee him, there is no beauty that they ſhould deſire him. He is Deſpiſed and rejected of men: they hide as it were their faces from him: he is deſpiſed, and they eſteem him not*, ch. 53. v. 2, 3. Thus it was plainly foretold that Chriſt our Redeemer ſhould be deſpiſed and reproached, and ſpoken againſt, in which *General* Predictions this *Particular* one is included, *viz.* that he ſhould be deſpiſed and defamed becauſe of the meanneſſe of the Place of his habitation: *he ſhall be called a Nazarene*, he ſhall be reproached and vilified by reaſon of his Education and Abode in that Town. Although the Propheſies which I have alledged are ſpoken generally and at large, yet this is clear and undeniable that if the Title of *Nazarene* was uſed by Chriſt's Enemies as a mark of their deſpiſing and rejecting him (which I ſhall make good anon,) then even this Particular Name was implied and contained in the General Prediction concerning him. Or, take it thus, though theſe Individuall words

words here set down by the Evangelist [*He shall be called a Nazarene*] are no where found in the Writings of the Prophets, yet the Sense and Meaning of them are there, which is sufficient: as in *Acts* 10. 42. St *Peter* alledges This as *testified by all the Prophets*, that *through Christ's name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of Sins*: and yet among all the Prophets there is not one extant that hath these words, which he here delivereth. He speaks not the very *words*, but the *sense* of the Prophets: and so doth St *Matthew* here, he tells us that *it was spoken of by the Prophets that Christ shall be called a Nazarene*, which very words though they doe not occurre in any Prophetick Writer of the Old Testament, yet the *meaning* and *Import* of them is to be found in those Writings, as I have shewed: for there we read that Christ, as well as his Followers, shall be despised and rejected, defamed and reproached, which is the true sense and meaning of these words [*He shall be called a Nazarene.*] Thus the *written Word* of God attests that he was to be called by this Name. But perhaps the Prophesies which were by *Tradition* spake expresly of this Appellation,

pellation, and foresignified to the Jews that this individual Title of *Nazarene* should be made use of, and applied to the *Messias* when he came into the world; to which also it is likely St *Matthew* here refers, as hath been said before.

The next thing to be proved is that this Prophecy was actually fulfilled. And here first *more generally* (taking this Name for a *Name of Reproach and Ignominy*) we can prove that it was fully accomplished in that our Saviour was actually reproached, miscalled, defamed, when he was here upon earth. They traduced his Birth and Patentage; they derided him for his supposed Fathers Trade, and perhaps his Own, as if it were some great blemish, some unpardonable crime to be of an Honest Calling. His Life was accused of Debauchery and Prophanesse, he was aspersed as a Glutton, and a Wine-bibber, he was reproached as a wilfull Violatour of the Sabbath; yea, whatsoever he said or did was matter of their Obloquy and Slander. All ranks of men conspired to revile the Blessed *Jesus*. He was mocked at by the *Sanhedrim*, by their Great Doctors and Rabbies, men of Beard and Gravity: he was also flouted at by the Gid-

Giddy *Multitude*, by the Common Rabble and baser ſort of People. The *Prieſts* fiercely cried out againſt him, and treated him as ignominiouſly as they uſed to do the *Scape-Goat* when it was to be packed away into the wilderneſſe. The *Laity* indeavoured to ſurpaſſe their Inſtructers, and doubled their ſpight againſt the *Holy Jeſus*. Nay, his own *Relations* diſgraced and abuſed him, ſome of his *Kindred* looked upon him as no other then a Diſtracted and Phrentick perſon, and accordingly they came in haſt from *Nazareth* to lay hold on him, and confine him. He is not only beſides himſelf, but he is Poſſeſſed, if you'l believe the *Phariſees*: he doth all his Miracles by Art Magick, by a Confederacy with the Prince of Devils and Apoſtate Spirits. In the Jewiſh Conſiſtory he is impeached of Blaſphemy; in the Civil Court, of Sedition and Treaſon: and laſtly, when he hung upon the Croſſe, they charged him with Deſpair and utter Diſtruſt of God. Thus from his firſt entrance into the world till his going out of it, he was the conſtant ſubject of mens Slanders and Reproaches. This *Prophecy* therefore in the Text was *in the general* fulfilled, in that he was thus egregiouſly

reproached and *traduced*. This Prediction [*He shall be called a Nazarene*] is made good, for he was called by all those Names which signifie *Disgrace* and *Reproach*, and This is one of them.

Besides, it was accomplished *in a generall way*, in as much as *Christs Disciples* and *Followers* were treated after the same manner: for what was done unto them is interpreted to be done unto Christ Himself. This I suppose will not be denied, and therefore we are only briefly to recount the ill usage in this kind which they met with. In the Evangelical History we are informed that the Apostles and Disciples of *Jesus* were a despised sort of men, that they were most unworthily aspersed and vilified, that they were loaden with all Obloquies and slanders. St *Paul* speaking of himself and his fellow Apostles, acquaints us, that they *were reviled and defamed, made as the filth of the world, and the off-scouring of all things*, 1 *Cor.* 4. 12, 13. And those that succeeded these First Worthies of the Church fared no better. It was confidently reported by their Enemies that they worshipped an Asses head, whence they had the Name of *Asinarii*. It was said that they met together

together before the Sun rose to murder their own infants, and that they then crammed themselves with their warm flesh, and glutted themselves with their reeking blood: and that when this was done, these Canibals, these Devourers of their own kind proceeded to acts of Filthinesse and Incest; yea, and that at all other times they lived in the practise of the most Flagitious sins, the most Execrable villanies. From the writings of the *Pagans*, and of those that *Apologized* for the Christians, we are ascertained that all manner of Falsities were invented by the Enemies of Christianity, and thrown upon the Professors of it. These poor vile abject Creatures stood exposed to the shock of their injurious tongues, and received all the filth which their Exulcerated minds could vomit forth upon them. To give you an example of the Highest Improvement of these mens Malitious Reviling, they had the impudence and effrontery to fasten upon the Christians even the Commission of those villanies which they acted themselves: thus when *Nero* had set *Rome* on fire, he laid the fact upon these Innocents, as both *Tacitus* and *Suetonius* tell us. It came to this at last, that

the very Name of Christian, without any addition whatsoever, was a sufficient *Reproach*. When they called any man a *Christian*, it was as much as to say he was a Criminal of the Highest Nature. Thus *in generall* the Prophecy here mentioned by the Evangelist is accomplished, the Christians, and in them Christ himself, were despised and rejected; they had all the Names and Marks of Reproach fastned upon them. Though they were aggrandized by the most Honourable Titles given them by God, yet they were debased and vilified by the Worst of Apellations conferred upon them by men. In this large sense the Prophecy is true, *they were called Nazarenes*; they, as well as our Lord himself, the Great and Noble Institutour of Christianity, were loaded with Contumelies and Reproaches.

But more *particularly*, we are to prove the Accomplishment of this Prophecy, by shewing you that this *individual Name* of *Nazarene*, or *one of Nazareth*, was used as a Reproachfull Appellative towards Christ and towards his Followers. We must know then that though *Nazareth* be called *a City* in this place of St *Matthew*, yet all agree that it was

a

a *Mean* and *Poor one*, and rather deſerved (if we look upon it in it ſelf) to be called a *Village*. Which is no unuſuall thing in Scripture, where we find places that have the Name of *Cities* are alſo called *Villages*, as in *Joſ.* 19. 7. 1 *Chron.* 4. 32. And in the New Teſtament, Small Towns or Villages are ſometimes ſtiled πόλεις & νεωμοπόλεις, *Mat.* 9. 35. *Mark* 1. 38. Of *Bethlehem* we may Particularly obſerve that 'tis called πόλις a *City*, in *Luke* 2. 4. but Κώμη a *Village*, in *John* 7. 42. We meet with the like in other Authors: So *Bethſura* is called a *City* by [a] *Joſephus*, and in the ſame place Κώμη a *Village* or *Town*. Thus *Nazareth*, though it have the name of a *City*, yet it was but a *mean Town*, or rather a *Village*: whence it was ſaid in a Proverbial way, *Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth? John* 1. 46. It was, as appears by this Common Saying, a ſorry Contemptible place, and yielded no inhabitant of any Note and Worth, unleſſe you will reckon Mecanicks and Poor Tradeſmen to be ſuch. A *Nazarene*, a *man of Nazareth*, was generally a Deſpiſed perſon among them. Hence it may be reaſonably inferr'd that

[a] *Antiqu. Jud. l.* 12. *c.* 14.

those who had a mind to disgrace and defame our Saviour Christ, used to reproach him with a Title taken from this poor little Town, and to call him a *Nazarene*, a man that belonged to that little Village, and consequently was some pitifull fellow. But this, you will say, is Conjecture only. I deny it, and give this reason for it, *viz.* because it is plainly grounded on Scripture. For we read in *Acts* 24. 5. that St *Paul* was accused by that Spruce Orator *Tertullus*, for being *a Ring-leader of the sect of the Nazarens*, i. e. of the *Christians*, who were called so from *Christ Jesus of Nazareth* their first Founder and Master. He being bred in that sorry Town, was in way of contumely called a *Nazarene* by those that disliked his doctrine and institutions. And from Him his followers derived that Name, and had it frequently given them by those that hated their way of Religion, especially when they solemnly undertook to accuse them before Great Ones, as *Tertullus* did the Apostle here before *Felix*. That Christ and those who professed Christianity were usually branded with the name of *Galilæans* (they being of that Country for the most part) is evident from *Luke* 23. 6.

Acts 2. 7. yea, the Name lasted till some hundreds of years after Christ, as may be gather'd from *Julian* the Apostate's crying out, (when he was struct by an unseen hand,) *O Galilæan thou hast vanquished me*, meaning without doubt the Blessed *Jesus*, who was now seated at the right hand of God in heaven. Not only *S. Paul* is called a [a] *Bald Pate Galilæan* by *Lucian*, but all the Primitive Christians were generally stigmatized with the title of *Galilæans* by *Julian*, *Porphyrius*, and other enemies of the Christian Religion. Now, this must be said with truth, that when they called Christ a *Galilæan*, and when they gave his followers that name, it was the same as if they had called them *Nazarens*, because *Nazareth* was so noted a place in *Galilee*. But, which is yet closer to our present business, the Primitive Christians were more particularly and Emphatically stiled *Nazarens* from that Town of this Name in *Galilee*, where *Jesus* was brought up and dwelt the greatest part of his life. This is with great evidence testified and confirmed by *Epiphanius*, who not only tells us that there was a sort of *Hereticks* called *Nazarenes*, but that the Orthodox Chri-

[a] Γαλιλαῖος ἀναφαλαντίας. *In Philopatr.*

stians also bore that name. He assures us that these were commonly known by the name of [f] *Nazarenes*, and that they had no other Noted Name among their Adversaries and Opposers. (Yea, at this day the *Jews* call the *Christians* [illegible] *Notzerim*, as we are informed by *Drusius* on *Acts* 24. 5. and there is no body I believe, will think that *Grotius* falsifies, when he saith the *Mahometans* at this day stile the Christians *Nazarenes*. *Grot.* in *Acts* 24. 5.) It is undeniable then that both *Christ* and his *followers* bore the name of *Nazarene*, and thus *was fulfilled that which was spoken by the Prophets*, (i. e. either *generally* by those that were Writers of the Old Testament, or *particularly* and *expressly* by some Other Prophets that were of great note among the Jews, and whose Sayings were delivered down to posterity) *viz. that Christ should be called a Nazarene.* He was really and truly called so. Among other Ignominious Names This very Perticular one of *Nazarene*, i. e. *a man of Nazareth*, was frequenly given him. For this word Ναζωραῖος here, and in *Mark* 10. 47. and other places (what ever some have fancied of it) is as much as Ναζαρεθαῖος,

[f] Πάντες δὲ Χριστιανοὶ Ναζωραῖοι τότε ὡσαύτως ἐκαλοῦντο, &c. *Adv. Hæres. l.* 1. *Hæres.* 29.

one

one of Nazareth. The former word is but an Abreviature of this latter, which is no unusuall thing in the stile and language of Scripture, as those who are conversant in the Hebrew and Greek Text know very well. Indeed the last Syllable *eth* in *Nazareth* is but a bare termination, and this (as all Grammarians will confess) is [g] Variable, and consequently the Adjective from this Substantive may be Ναζαραιος, or Ναζαρηνος (as it is in *Mark* 1. 24. & *Luke* 4. 34.) as well as Ναζαρεθαιος, the *eth* being not of the Essence of the word. The Text then may be either rendred thus, *He shall be called a Nazarean*, or a *Nazarene* (as we find it translated) or a *Nazarethite*. It is not material which of these words we use: only it is to be remembred that we are to understand by it *One of Nazareth*, one of that Small contemptible Village, one that was undervalued and despised because of his rise and habitation there. Such was our Blessed Lord and Saviour, He was scorn'd and contemned as a poor silly Villager. But our Inspired Author assures us that it was foretold *by the Prophets* that he should be *despised* and *reproached*, and *spoken against*; in which Gene-

[g] Thence it is sometimes *Nazara*, as well as *Nazareth*, according to that of *Juvencus*, *lib.* 1.---*ubi Nazara felix.*

General Predictions; is included the sense and meaning of this Particular one, *He shall be called a Nazarene*: for this *calling him a Nazarene*, or *one of Nazareth*, is an evident token of their *despising* him, and is a downright *reproaching* and *speaking against* him.

Thus I have given you my thoughts concerning this Text of Scripture, and have attempted to offer to you the Plain and Genuine meaning of it; and so far as I can judge, it is impertinent and incoherent, it is trifling and ridiculous, to Interpret it in either of the senses mentioned in the beginning of this Discourse. If we do so, the Connection of the words is Illogical, Irrational and Absurd. This is my present apprehension of this place; and if I be mistaken, let it be remembred that I have been offering a Notion about a Controverted Text, not deciding a Point of Faith, and consequently there is no great danger in the mistake.

The

The second TEXT Enquired into, *viz.*

1 Corinth. XI. 14.

Doth not even nature it self teach you, that if a man have long hair it is a shame unto him?

IN this Chapter the Apostle treats of these two things, First, of the *Decent Habit of men and women in their publick meetings*, from the beginning to the 17th v. Secondly, of *the Right Administration of the Lords Supper*, to the end of the Chapter. Under the first head he reproves the *Corinthians* because *the Men among them covered their heads*, and *the Women uncovered theirs* when they prayed or prophesied. And here let us see in what manner the Apostle reproves and refutes this practise. First, before he comes directly to it, he premiseth and setteth

the

the Grand Order or Constitution which is appointed by God, *viz.* that *the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God*, v. 3. That is, Christ as he is Mediatour is subordinate to God the Father, and man is next in dignity to Christ, and the woman to the man. *Christ Jesus* is the Head to whom the Man is *immediately* subject, and ought to be Govern'd by: and though Christ be the Head of the Woman also, yet it is [a] with the interposition of Man, who is as it were her Subordinate Head. This is the true series of the mans Superiority over the Woman, which S. *Paul* layeth as the foundation of his Reproof in this Chapter. Christ is subject to his Father, as he is man, and as he is the Minister of mans Redemption: the Man is subject to Christ, and the Woman to the Man. Upon this foundation he raises This superstructure afterwards, that a Man ought to *uncover his head*, and a Woman to *Cover hers* in the Congregation, that the former may not dishonour Christ, nor the latter her Husband: for by one the man shews his Freedom and Dominion, by the other the Woman testifies her subjection. And here

[a] *Viro mediante veluti capite subordinato.* Estius *in loc.*

here the Apoſtle lays open the Diſorder and Faultineſſe of the Chriſtian *Corinthians* as to this particular. He complains that that Divine Order before mentioned was not ſtrictly obſerved by them: for whereas the Woman ought to be ſubordinate to the Man as her Head and Governour, they uſed a Cuſtom which was contrary to it. It was This, the Women among them after the Heatheniſh way layd aſide their Veils in publick and religious Aſſemblies, and appear'd with their naked heads: and the men took the womens Veils, and covered their heads and faces with them. The Unfitneſs and Unreaſonableneſs of which practiſe (beſides that it was a *Pagan* uſage, eſpecially among the Prieſts and Prieſteſſes) the Apoſtle declares in thoſe words, (v. 4) *Every man praying or propheſying with his head cover'd diſhonours his head*, i. e. he diſhonours *Chriſt*. He acknowledgeth by this *Covering* that *Chriſt* is not ſet by God over him as Chief Governour, that he is not Supreme on earth: and conſequently he detracts from his own True Worth and Eminency, and diſgraces his Sex, as if not *Chriſt* but ſome other were his Head. To be *Uncovered* is a ſign

of

of his Superiority, but a *Covering* on the head is a token of Subjection: therefore it is against the Dignity of his Sex and of Christ likewise, whom he should represent, as a Man, thus to be *Covered*. And as for the Other sex, *Every woman*, saith the Apostle, v. 5. *that prayeth or propheseth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head*, i. e. her Husband, or her Own Head by shewing it openly naked. The meaning is, she doth that which is contrary to Divine Order and Natural Modesty, for by putting on her Veil she ought to acknowledge her Inferiority and Subjection to her husband; but she throwing that aside acts in opposition to it, and at the same time she appears in an Immodest guise in the place of Solemn Worship. It follows in the same verse, *For that* (i. e. having her head uncovered) *is even all one as if she were shaven*, which is most Indecorous and Shamefull. Baldness or Shaving is Unnatural, and therefore Hatefull in a Woman, for she should rather nourish her hair; of which afterwards. This may give some Light to that in *Deut.* 21. 11, 12. *When thou seest among the Captives a beautifull woman, and hast a desire to her, that thou wouldest have her*

to

to thy wife, *then thou shalt bring her home to thy house, and she shall shave her head, and pare her nails*, or rather, according to the Hebrew, *make her nails*, and *let them grow*. The Design is to make the captive Maid *Deformed*, that the person who was taken with her might have the heat of his affection abated towards her. In order to this she must not only *let her nails grow*, but *shave her head*, which is a Shame and Deformity, contrary to the *usual* the Comely Adorning of the head, of which I shall speak anon. And it is added, v. 13. *She shall put off the raiment of her captivity*, i. e. the Handsome Attire she was in when she was taken captive, and she must put on *Mournfull Sordid Apparel a full month*, as you read in the next words. All which sheweth that she was to be kept up in the mans house (who took her in war) in a Neglectfull, yea Deformed plight, and that *shaving her head* was part of that Deformity: and consequently that this is Uncomely and Disgracefull, yea Loathsome and Unsufferable in that Sex. Therefore our Apostle subjoins, v. 6. *If the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn*, i. e. for her to be without a Veil, without

a Covering on her head, is no less Unseemly, yea Detestable, then if she were shorn: she may as well be without any hair at all. *But* (as he goes on in the same verse) *if it be a shame to be shorn or shaven* (as most certain it is, seeing the *having of long hair is her Glory*, as you read afterwards) *let her be covered.* Thus much for the Woman. As for the Man, *he ought not to cover his head, for as much as he is the Image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man*, v. 7. Which is another Argument to prove the aforesaid Order or Constitution, *viz.* that Man is more *immediately* and properly the Image of God, the representation of the Divine Excellency, and therefore must be Uncovered. In comparison of the Woman he is the *Glory of God*, and that primarily, but the Woman is but the *Image and Glory of the Man.* Again, the Apostle argues from the Original of Man, v. 8. *For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man*, i. e. Man hath this Prerogative to be immediately from God, but the Woman was from Man. He argues also from the End as well as the Origine of Man, v. 9. *Neither was the man*

crea-

created for the woman, but the woman for the man; as much as to ſay, the woman was made to be a *Meet Help*, to be Adminiſtring and Subſervient to Man: conſequently ſhe is not *ſuperiour* to him, but ſhe is to behave her ſelf Submiſſively, and therefore to *cover her head*, which is a ſign of that Submiſſion. The Apoſtle pleads for this behaviour as due alſo in reſpect of the Angels, v. 10. *For this cauſe the woman ought to have power on her head becauſe of the Angels*; the explication of which I ſhall remit to another place. But although this was the rate of St *Pauls* Divinity, yet in the two next verſes he doth a little moderate his diſcourſe, and qualifie what he had ſaid in the 8th and 9th verſes, to which this ought to be annexed. Becauſe he might ſeem to have been ſomewhat too Harſh to the Women, he prudently and cautiouſly mitigates and tempers his former Argument here, that it may not redound to the diſparagement of the Sex. *Nevertheleſs* (ſaith he,) *neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man in the Lord. For as the woman is of the man, even ſo is the man alſo by the woman: but all things of God,*

v. 11, 12. Having thus salv'd his harsh doctrine, he proceeds to a new Topick, namely the Natural Congruity and Decency of the thing it self which he had been urging. And here he appeals to Themselves, and their Own Judgement concerning the matter he is speaking of, and reproving them for, *viz.* Mens praying with their heads covered, and Women with theirs uncovered. *Judge in your selves* (saith he:) *Is it comely that a woman pray unto God unCovered?* v. 13. It is so Reasonable a thing which I speak of, and now require of you, that I submit it to the Natural sentiments and decision of your own minds. And here the words of the Text are brought in, *Doth not Nature it self teach you that if a man hath long hair, it is a shame to him? But* (on the contrary, v. 15.) *if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her.*

By this short Descant on this part of the Chapter you may perceive the Design and Scope of the words which I am now to treat of, Concerning *men on womens wearing their Hair.* Expositors have exceedingly varied in their indeavours to Joyn these words with the former: many things very much Strained and

and Misapplied are said by them; But upon a deliberate view of the whole, I take This to be the True and Natural Coherence of the words; They are brought in here by the Apostle as a *Reason* of the Precept he gave them, *viz.* that Women must be Veiled or Covered, and Men Uncovered when they pray. To perswade and convince them of the *Reasonableness* of this Command he appeals to *Nature*, and tells them that *This* teacheth them that very thing which he enjoyns them: and *This* disalloweth of that which he forbids them. As if he had said, your selves may in your own minds and consciences judge of the Decency of Mens uncovering their heads when they pray, and of the contrary Indecency of this practise in Women. I have shewed you that these are founded on the Appointment of Heaven, the Order of our Universal Governour, the Principles of Nature, the Law of Reason, and the Distinction which ought to be between the Sexes. This is no infrequent thing that your duty is commended to you even by the dictates of your Reasonable Nature. Several things which may be urged upon you are of this sort, the very Natural Light which

you are indued with, ſuggeſts the obſervance of them. As now, becauſe I am ſpeaking of *Covering* or *Uncovering the head*, I will inſtance in a thing which is nearly related to it, *viz.* the Manner of wearing the hair of the head, What is commendable in Men, and what in Women as to this matter: Here the very Light of Nature ſhines upon you, and directs you what to do. If you will conſult your ſelves, and the Natural ſuggeſtions of your minds, you ſhall plainly diſcover what is your duty. *Even nature it ſelf teacheth you, that if a man have long hair, it is a ſhame to him: but if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her.*

But all perſons that have Commented and Treated on theſe words doe not ſo eaſily agree about the meaning of them: Yea, there is a very great Diſagreement among them. And the reaſon is, becauſe they give different ſenſes of theſe two Principal words, [*Nature*] and that other which we tranſlate [*to have long hair.*] The only *Difficulty* therefore lying in theſe two words, I will enquire 1. What is meant by *Nature*. 2. What is meant by *having long hair*, or rather what the Greek word, which is here ſo rendred, truly ſignifies.

First,

First, let us enquire what is meant by *Nature*. *Nature* here *teacheth* us something, but we cannot tell what that is which it *teacheth*, unless we know what *Nature* is. And in order to that, we must acquaint our selves how this word [*Nature*] is taken. It sometimes signifies the Natural and Inbred Corruption of mankind. Thus we are said to be *by Nature the Children of wrath*, Eph. 2. 3. i. e. by our Common Degeneracy and Apostacy in *Adam* we are liable to the wrath of God. And so generally in the *Fathers* and *Ecclesiastical Writers* the word is taken, it denotes the Corrupt Nature of man, the original Depravation of the sons of men. But seeing the Apostle here speaks of something which is Good and Laudable that *Nature* teacheth, thence we may infer that This is not, and cannot be the meaning of the word in this place. There are Three other significations of it, and one or more of them must undeniably be understood here.

First, it is taken for the *Law of Nature in General*, Natural Light or Knowledge, the Inward dictates of Reason in a mans breast. Thus the Gentiles *doe by nature the things contain'd*

in the Law, Rom. 2. 14. i. e. they have a Rational Principle in them which prompts them to do those things. *This* hath its name both in Greek and Latin from its [b] *being born* with a man, it is the Innate and Congenite property of the Rational soul of man. And because God is the God of Nature, and it is He that hath planted in our minds Reasons of Good and Evil, therefore this becomes a Divine Law, and is set up in mens hearts as such. What is dictated by Right Reason or the Law of Nature may be said to be dictated by God Himself. Therefore St *Chrysostom* on this place saith, that [c] when *Nature* is said *to teach us*, the Apostle doth as good as say, *God teacheth* for it is He that hath contrived and framed Nature.

[b] Φύσις, ἀπὸ τῆς φύεσθαι: *Natura, à nascendo.*

[c] Ὅταν δὲ εἴπω τὴν φύσιν, τὸν θεὸν λέγω. ὁ γὰρ τὴν φύσιν δημιουργήσας αὐτός ἐστιν. *Homil. in 1 Cor.* 11.

Secondly, It is taken for that *Particular Law* or Dictate of *Nature which teacheth a Difference of Sexes*: as in *Rom.* 1. 26, 27. *Their women did change their natural use into that which is against nature: likewise the men left the natural use of the women.* Here it is evident that φύσις, & φυσικὴ χρῆσις, & παρὰ φύσιν signifie the Discrimination of the Sex, and what is suitable or disagreeable to this Discrimination. *Nature*

ture here must needs signifie the *Distinction of Sex*, i. e. the Particular Law of Nature concerning that Distinction, and not the Law of Nature in General; for though other sins, as Fornication and Adultery, are against the Laws of Nature and Reason as well as This, yet This is against the Law of the Sex, and the Distinction of man and woman, which is a Particular and Individual Law of Nature, and wholly different from those others. You will also find This to be the signification of the word φύσις in *Lexicons* and *Glossaries* from very Good Authors, as *Thucydides*, *Josephus*, *Philo*, &c. *Salmasius* proves φύσις to be *Sexus*: and answerably to this meaning of the word παρὰ φύσιν & κατὰ φύσιν are understood in *Diodorus Siculus*, *Josephus* and others.

Thirdly, the word φύσις may be rendered *Custom*: and this unquestionably is sometimes the meaning of the word in Good Greek Authors. The Verb πέφυκε is as much as *solet*, and thence the Verbal Nown φύσις, which is derived thence, signifies *Custom*. But this is not the proper and genuine signification, but is only a Derivative sense, because what is Natural is usual and common;

and again, what we Use our selves to doth as it were become Natural to us; thence *Custom* is said to be a *second Nature*, yea, a [d] Long and Inveterate Custom is stronger then Nature it self. So that according to this threefold acception of the word, there is a threefold Opinion concerning the meaning of the Text. 1. Some hold that it is a Law of Natural Reason that a man should not have Long Hair, i. e. such hair as women have. So *Vorstius* and *Poimenander* (two Belgick Divines) understand the words, and their Countryman *Grotius* is not wholly averse to it, for he is willing to grant that it is a Custom founded on Natural dictates. *Doth not Nature it self teach you, that* &c. i. e. Doth not the Inbred and Natural Light in your minds dictate this to you? 2. Others say the Text speaks of that Particular Law of Nature which teacheth there must be a Difference between Sexes. So *Salmasius* and *Revius* interpret the place. *Doth not Nature it self teach you, that* &c. i. e. the Sex, the Difference of Sex, the Distinction of man and woman teacheth you this, it being the *Law of Nature* to put difference between man and woman as to *Clothes*, and *Wearing*

[d] Ἐγχρονίζον ἔθος φύσεως κραταιότερον ἐστι.

the

the hair. 3. Some hold that it is *Custom* only which teacheth this. Thus *Calvin, Grotius, Hammond* understand the words: but it is not well agreed among them whether it was a Particular or a General Custom, whether it was a *Custom* among all Nations, or some only. Thus far we have considered the First Principal word in the Text.

The Other word [κομᾶι] which is rendred here [*to have long hair*] is variously taken also: which is the other reason why this place is so difficult to be understood. The word [κομᾶν] is as much as [*gloriari, superbire*] in very sufficient Authors; but because it is evident that That cannot be the meaning here, I will pass it by. The other two significations of the word are pertinent in this place. Κομᾶν signifies either barely to *Nourish the hair, and let it grow at length,* or to *Bind it up in a neat manner, to dress, trim and adorn it.* These are the two noted significations of this Greek word. Accordingly I will consider the Apostles words 1. as they may be meant of *Long Hair*: 2. as they may be understood of Hair that is *Tied up, Trimmed and Adorned.*

First, taking [κομᾶν] for [*having long*

long hair,] let us enquire in the First place whether *Custom* teacheth us that we ought not to wear such hair; Secondly, let us see whether *Natural Reason* teacheth this: and Thirdly, what the *Distinction of Sexes* dictates in this case.

I. If *Custom* be meant by φύσις here, let us examine what *Custom* there is for *Long Hair*, and that first among the *Jews*, secondly among the *Gentiles*. First, what was the *Custom* of the *Jews*? Among them the Divine Law forbad the Priests to [c] *shave either head or beard*. But though they were not to do this, yet they were not to wear their hair Long, but a middle way was prescribed them, that is, a Moderate cutting of the hair, as we read in *Ezek.* 44. 20. *They shall not shave their heads, nor suffer their locks to grow long, they shall only poll their heads.* Neither Baldness nor too Long hair were to be used, both these Extremes were to be shunn'd in opposition to the *Heathens* (as you shall hear afterwards) who sometimes cut off all their hair, at other times let it grow Neglected and Long. But a Decency and Moderation are here enjoyn'd the *Priests*, and they were to be Examples

[c] Lev. 21. 5.

to

to the *People*. And it is likely the people did follow this Pattern at first, and wore their hair of a moderate length, although in this as well as in other things they afterwards swerved from the Rule, and were dispensed with because of the hardness of their hearts. Thus some of the *Jewish* people had very long hair, and the Pictures which we have of them represent them oftentimes so. But from the beginning it was not so, for it is probable that the same Law obliged the People and Priests, i. e. that they should neither shave their heads, nor wear their hair long. But it will be asked, where is this Prohibition? I answer, one part of it is expresly set down, and the other is implied. *All* persons among them were forbid to shave, or cut close their hair, *Lev.* 19. 27. *Ye shall not round the corners of your heads, neither shalt thou mar the corners of thy beard.* They are forbid here the Circular Cut of their hair, i. e. to cut the hair of their heads or beards after the superstitious manner of the *Pagans*, who used (as several Learned Writers inform us) *to round the hair* of their heads, that is, to cut it off all on the sides, and to leave only a Lock behind, or a Tuft at top, which

[f] *Bonfrerius, Bochart, Grotius, Heinsius.*

which they devoted to some God or Goddess. This particular way of Cutting the hair was used in the time of Mourning for the dead, as I gather from the next verse, where the *making any cutting in the flesh for the dead* is forbid. Their Cutting themselves was a sign of their Excessive Lamentation for the deceased: and so this *rounding the corners of the head* (i. e. cutting the hair off on all sides) being joyned with it, is to be interpreted (I conceive) of Immoderate Mourning for the dead, Lamenting as the *Heathens* used to lament their departed friends. And to confirm this Interpretation, you will find these two joyned together again in *Deut.* 14. 1. and in *Jer.* 16. 6. For *otherwise* you may remember that they made themselves Bald at Funerals, and they did not offend in so doing. We read that this was the practise of the best among them. And they were invited to it by the Prophets, or rather by God himself. *The Lord in that day called for Baldness, Isa.* 7. 15. and so in *Isai.* 22. 12. *Jer.* 7. 29. *Mic.* 7. 18. They would not have been call'd upon to Lament after this manner, if it had been sinful. So then, this Baldness or Tonsure at Fune-

Funerals and other Sad Occasions was not unlawful among the *Jews*, only so far as it was Superstitious, and in imitation of the Idolatrous *Gentiles*. Therefore that Law in *Leviticus* chiefly respects the Idolatrous Custom of throwing their Hair into the Sepulchres of the dead, and devoting them to the departed souls, and such like practises among the *Pagans*. But now from this particular *Custom* of cutting off their hair, or Shaving in case of Great Mourning, we may gather that at Other times they did not cut so close, for it is clear that if they did, they would have left nothing to cut when the Mourning Time came. It is reasonable therefore to conclude that they generally wore their hair of a Moderate Dimension, and as they cut not close, so in that Spherical way before spoken of, so they ran not into the *Other* Extream, *viz.* of indulging Uncut and Long Hair. And *This* is as evident as the other, for the practise of the *Nazarites* is a demonstration of it. These were a peculiar sort of Devotionists among the *Jews* who suffered their hair to grow, and wore it Long, and put it in fillets, or knots and locks, as the women then did. *Samson* was

such a *Nazarite* as *A razor shall not come upon his head*, saith the Angel to *Manoahs* wife. And God promised him that as long as he continued a *Nazarite*, and cut not his Hair, but let it grow, this should be a token to him of that Strength which God extraordinarily endued him with: but he brake the Vow of *Nazaritism*, and suffered his hair to be cut off. Some distinguish between *Proper* and *Temporary Nazarites*: among the former they reckon this *Samson*, *Samuel*, and *John the Baptist*; among the latter *Absalom* (who cut his hair the thirtieth day of his Vow,) and S. *Paul*, who had made a Vow not to shave for a time, but this being expired he cut his hair after a solemn manner, as was the Custom, and is expressed in *Acts* 18. 18. *Having shorn his head in Cenchrea, for he had a vow.* (Though it is thought by some that this refers to *Aquila*, just before mentioned, and not to S. *Paul*.) And such were the *Nazarites* spoken of in *Acts* 21. 23, 24. Yea Dr *Lightfoot* is of opinion that these *Corinthians*, some of them at least, in a superstitious humour affected *Nazaritism*, and that this was the occasion of the Apostle's reproving them for their Long Hair.

§ *Horæ Hebraicæ.*

Hair. But though it be the received opinion that there were some *Perpetual*, and others *Temporary Nazarites*, yet I am not satisfied about it, I rather think that they were *All* left to their liberty to vow as they pleased, and that some observed the Vow a longer, and others a shorter time. He that perufeth *Num.* 6. (which Chapter is wholly spent in setting down the Law of *Nazarites*) will be perswaded to think so, especially if he well weigh the 17, & 18. v. Hence it will appear that it is a mistake that some *Nazarites never* cut their hair: From this place it is clear that none of them (for This is an Universal Law concerning *Nazarites*) nourished their hair Continually, but that after such a certain time they cut it off, and devoted it to God. *All Nazarites* might alter a set season dispose of their Hair. But that which I infer from the premises is this, that the Law of *Nazaritism* concerning Long and Uncut Hair (though but for a time) proves that the wearing of *Long Hair* was not the common usage of the Jewish people. If it was peculiar to few, and that by Vow, then it was not the practise of the general body of the Nation. The *Nazarites*

abstain'd

abstain'd from cutting their hair: therefore others (who were not obliged by the Law of *Nazaritism*) did cut their hair, and suffered it not to grow Long. *Nazarites* by Vow wore Long Hair, therefore those who were not tied by that Vow (as the Generallity of the Jewish people) took up another usage. *Long Hair* was a thing *Unusual* and *Extraordinary* in those Religious and Separate persons: therefore it was the *Usual Custom* not to have long hair. These I take to be very Rational Inferences. This was the first thing I undertook, to acquaint you what was the *Custom* of the *Jews*. And here there is something more to be seen and gathered then among *Other People* of the world, because besides the Law of Nature, they had the Law of God to direct them in this as well as in other things.

In the second place let us see the practise of the *Gentiles*. The *Arabians*, among whom *Job* lived, used to *shave their heads* in time of Mourning and Lamentation, as you may gather from his practise, *Job* 1. 20. And this was so notorious that [h] *Herodotus* testifies of them that they were clipp'd as *Apollo* was, in a round figure, they cut off all the

[h] *In Thalia.*

the angles about their temples. These are thought by some to be קַצְּצֵי פֵאָה in *Jer.* 9. 26. & 25. 23. *præcisi angulo*, those that are cut off in the corners, i. e. those that cut their hair round, and left no corners, *viz.* when they had a solemn occasion of Lamenting. From *Arabia* if you pass into *Egypt*, you may gather from their custom of letting their hair grow Long in time of Calamity and Sorrow, that they did not nourish *Long Hair* at other times. Thus [i] *Herodotus* acquaints us that the *Egyptians* (contrary to the *Jews*) in the days of Mourning let their hair grow Long on their heads. The truth of which is confirmed to us by [k] the Sacred Records, which tell us that *Joseph* cut his hair when he was released from Prison, and was to goe into King *Pharaohs* presence. But *Herodotus* in the same place adds that the *Egyptians* used to shave their beards in time of Sorrow, though they let the hair of their heads grow. And therefore in the *Egyptian* Hieroglyphicks, where *Hair cut off* signifies *Grief* and *Bondage*, it must be understood of the Hair of the beard, not of the head. And as the *people* indulged not themselves in an *Excessive Length of hair*,

[i] Ἀντεῖπι τὰς τρίχας ξυρέονται. *Lib.* 2. *cap.* 36.

[k] *Gen.* 41. 14.

so neither did their *Priests*; for the foresaid Author relates that they were so far from this, that they were all of them Shaven. But the *Grecians* make the greatest figure here, and therefore I will in the next place shew what their Custom and Practice was as to the wearing of their Hair. That these people of old were used to wear their *hair Long* we learn from their constant Epithet in *Homer*, Κομοωντες. Though it is certain that at first the *Grecians* were of another fashion. Short or Moderately-grown hair was thought by them to be best, and accordingly they used themselves to it: the *Lacedæmonians* especially were noted for this. But if you would know how they came to alter their primitive usage, I am able to satisfie you by offering These following things to your thoughts. 1. It was a *Philosophick* humour to wear the *hair long*: which though it began at first with their Beards, yet afterwards it proceeded higher, to the hair of their Heads. The reason was, because Gravity and Majesty were thought to be in this sort of Hair. And yet these very men, who of all others one would think should not be fickle and inconstant, ran from

one

one Excess to a contrary one. Hence it is that in *Aristophanes* sometimes the *Philosophers* are laughed at as κομῶντες, at other times for being ἐν Χρῷ κεκαρμένοι; one while they appeared with long Locks flowing loosly on their shoulders, another while they were shorn to the very Skin: and both these Extreams were the effects of Sordidness and Covetousness, and because they had a mind to spare Charges. Some of the *Philosophers* wore short hair on their Heads, but Long Beards. But the *Cynicks* and *Stoicks* were all shaved close. 2. It may be the *Poets* had some influence here as well as the *Philosophers*: They generally described their *Gods*, (excepting *Apollo*) with Long hair, and so the Limners drew them; wherefore it is no wonder that Mortals were induced to imitate the Gods. 3. They indulged a great *Length of hair* because they thought it *Beautifull*. This is a reason *Eustathius* gives of the Epithee in *Homer* before mentioned. It seems the *Greeks* very much affected Comliness and Beauty, and they perswaded themselves that these were augmented by their Dangling Locks; hereupon they were very solicitous to nourish them. 4. Another Reason

(which may be thought to be almost inconsistent with the former) was this, they did it to strike *Terrour* into their Enemies. Thus particularly of the *Lacedæmonians*, [1] *Herodotus* reports that they began to wear Long hair and Beard when they turned Warriors, and he tells the particular Time, *viz.* when they began the war against the *Argives*. Nay, *Xenophon* relates that *Lycurgus*, their famous Lawgiver and Governor, would have them wear their hair long and dissheveld, to fright their Enemies. Hence the forenamed Commentator on *Homer*, when he gives an account why the Grecian souldiers tricked up themselves, and wore Long Hair, saith it was not only εἰς κάλλος, but διὰ τὸ φοβερὸν, not only to make them look Beautifully, but Formidably, to please their own eyes, and to affright their Enemies, to shew at once the Lustre and Terrour, the Bravery and Dreadfulness of War. But however the *Grecians* thought and acted in those ages when they became Corrupted, yet it is not to be questioned that the Thoughts and Actions of the Wisest among them were of a different kind. The Scholiast on *Aristophanes* recites it as an *Athenian* Law, that [m] the Soul-

[1] *Lib.* 1.

[m] Τοὺς νέους (φαλακροὺς) μηκέτι ἀβροδαίτους εἶναι, μηδὲ κομᾶν.

Souldiers must not pamper themselves, neither wear hair long. And as for That Pretence of theirs for letting their hair grow to an exceeding great *Length, viz.* that they might thereby Affright their Enemies, it was afterwards found weak and insufficient, and the *Grecians* thought good to alter this custom; which was done upon occasion of the *Abantes*, a warlike people, and Skilful in arms, who because they used to fight close, cut off the hair of their heads before, that their enemies might not take them by it when they fought. These men let their hair grow only behind, and therefore are called [n] ὄπιθεν κομόωντες. This was partly put in practise afterwards by *Alexander* the Great's Army in their *Asian* Expedition, that they might grapple with the Foe with the greater freedom. And for this reason all the *Macedonian* Souldiers shaved their heads, saith [o] *Plutarch*, that their enemies might have no hold of them in that part. 5. They were pleased to make the Difference of Wearing the Hair to be a mark of *Difference between Freemen and Slaves.* Especially among the *Lacedæmonians* the *Freemen* only did nourish their hair: whence that of *Aristophanes*, [p] Δοῦλος ὢν κόμην ἔχεις,

[n] *Iliad. β.*

[o] *In Theseo.*

[p] *In Avibus.*

Thou being but a ſervant wearest long hair, which is a very Unfitting thing in thee. Of theſe *Spartans* [q] *Ariſtotle* ſpeaks, ſaying, It is a good and laudable thing among them to have Long Hair, for it is a Badg of Liberty, whereas Servants and Slaves were ſhaved. Thus you ſee how *Long Hair* became Modiſh among the *Greeks*: they had one pretence or other to commend this Faſhion. Yet they could not but be ſenſible that this was an Upſtart uſage, and that they varied herein from their *priſtine cuſtom*. It may be from a reflection upon this, and to make ſome amends, and to expiate as it were for this their folly, they afterwards brought up the cuſtom of cutting their hair, and conſecrating the firſt fruits of it to ſome God or Goddeſs. This was the firſt Notable thing they did as ſoon as they were grown Men, and came to a perfect uſe of Reaſon. Nothing is more frequent in thoſe Writers who give an account of the Manners and Cuſtoms of the *Greeks* then this, that it was a general uſe among them to nouriſh their hair till they were grown up in years, and then to poll it, and dedicate it to ſome Deity, as to *Æſculapius*, or *Bacchus*,

[q] Ἐν Λακεδαίμονι κομᾶν καλὸν· ἐλευθερίας γὰρ σημεῖον. *Rhet. l.* 1. *c.* 9.

chus, or *Hercules*, or to the *Nymphs*, or the country *Rivers* where they were born, as [r] *Achilles* did. Others consecrated their hair to *Diana*, but most persons dedicated it to *Apollo*, and laid it up in his Temple at *Delphos*, as [s] *Theseus* did. *Pindar*, *Æschilus*, and others give testimony concerning this Consecrating their hair: which I conceive was an Expiating for their former wearing of it so long. But, alas! after these first-fruits of their hair (which they call'd κόμαι πρώτιαι) were thus dedicated by them, and when they came to mens estate, they thought they might take liberty for the future, and indulge the Length of their locks, as they had done before. But then at certain times, as if they were conscious to themselves of their faultiness in wearing their hair after too Luxurious a manner, they corrected themselves for it when they grew more Sober, and had Occasion to *Mourn* and *Lament*. Then off went their Shaggy Locks; and their Bald Pates appeared: they seemed now by their Baldness to repent of the Contrary Folly, and to bewail it by this Symbal of Grief. But behold again the fickle humour of these men! They testifi'd their Mourning not only by Bald-

[r] Hom. Iliad. Ψ.

[s] Plutarch. in Thes.

ness, but by letting their hair grow Long. They imitated the contrary Customs of the *Jews* and *Egyptians*; the former of which shaved close in time of Mourning, the latter went with Neglected hair and Uncut. That the *Grecians* practised this *latter*, is expressly witnessed by *Plutarch*, who saith that [t] if any Calamity happen'd among them, though the women were shorn, yet the men cut not their hair all the time. And as for the *former*, but Contrary usage, [u] *Herodotus* assures us that in his days the *Argives* (the Antientest *Grecians*) expressed their Sorrow and Mourning by cutting their hair off, and shaving their heads. Or, if this be questioned, because it is but a single Instance, the Reader may consult [x] *Bochart*, who will supply him with a great many. Now from these *Contraries* and *Extreams* we may certainly gather what was the *usual* and *Ordinary Custom* of the *Greeks* as to their hair. Their running out into Excess at those extraordinary times acquaints us that they were Moderate at other times. Though I must say this, there was a great Alteration as to this matter, in respect of the Age; for in one Age the *Greeks* were more inclined to

[t] Κὶ γὰς παρ' Ελλησιν ὅταν δυσυχία τις γένηται, κείρονται μὸ αἱ γυναῖκες, κομῶσι δὲ οἱ ἄνδρες. *Quæst. Roman.*

[u] *Lib.* 2.

[x] *De animal. sacr.*

to wear *Long Hair* then in another, as might be proved from their Hiſtorians. It is certain that this was not their fault *at firſt*, they then wore their hair Moderately, but by degrees, and for ſeveral pretended reaſons (as hath been ſhewed) they degenerated into the cuſtom of *Long Hair*.

The practiſe of the *Romans* is next to be enquired into. They did ſometimes, as the *Grecians*, expreſs their *Grief* by cutting off their hair: eſpecially in time of great *Danger* they did this. In a ſtorm at ſea, when they were affraid of Shipwrack they ſhaved their heads, as appears from that of *Juvenal*,

Tuti ſtagna ſinus gaudent ibi vertice raſo,
Garrula ſecuri narrare pericula nautæ.

Petronius Arbiter and others confirm this uſage, and perhaps this is the meaning of St *Pauls* words, *Acts* 27. 34. *There ſhall not a hair fall from the head of any of you*, i. e. the tempeſt at ſea ſhall not be ſo great and dangerous that you ſhall have occaſion to ſhave your heads, as the cuſtom is in ſuch caſes. But this is certain, that the *Romans* were not ignorant that *Hair* was given by Nature for a Covering and Ornament

ment to mankind, and consequently they look'd upon the being Deprived of it as a Penal and Shameful thing. Accordingly Shaving the head was the badg of a Vile Light fellow, as *Cicero* saith with a quibble, *Idcirco capite & supercilio semper est rasus, nè unum pilum boni viri habere dicatur.* Thus he speaks of a Trifling fellow who had cut himself close, and left no hair at all. And that the hair was wont to be cut off in Mockery and Disgrace, is evident from what *Domitian* did to *Apollonius Tyaneus*; after he clapt him up in prison (saith [1] *Philostratus*) he sent a barber thither to poll his head, and cut off his Philosophick beard. Hence it is that *Lucian* brings in a *Philosopher* in one of his *Dialogues*, and *Charon* cutting off his beard. The [2] *damnati ad metalla* were served thus, and *Tacitus* and others tell us that it was the custom of the *Romans* to shave the heads of their *Servants*. And I am of the opinion that it was intended to be a Memento to the *Liberti* of their former Base and Low condition, that they [3] received the hat or cap with shaved heads, when they were made Free. Though I must confess there was a huge *Difference* and

[1] *In vitâ Apollon. l. 7.*

[2] *Cyprian. Epist. 77.*

[3] *Ut ego hodie raso capite calvus accipiam pileum*, Plaut. *in Amphitr.*

Vari-

Variety as to this among the Gentiles, which being not taken notice of hath occasioned Mistakes among some Criticks. *Criminals* and *Malefactors* had their heads shorn sometimes; and at other times they were not permitted to cut their hair. And so it was with their *Slaves*: among some of the *Romans*, *Shaving* was a token of Slavery, but among others of Liberty. Yet most commonly the former prevailed, but especially among the *Romans*, who look'd on Hair as a great Decency and Ornament. But notwithstanding this, I doe not find that the better and more knowing *Romans*, were Excessive in the length of their hair. I grant that before they were Civilized, and taught to govern themselves in some tolerable manner, they neglected the cutting of their hair. [b] *Varro* saith it was a great while, almost five hundred years, before *Italy* knew any such thing as a Barber. And some of the Old Statues of the *Romans* represent them with hair of a very great Length. But when knowledge and manners were cultivated, they lopt their locks. The Pictures of the very *Emperours* (even the most effeminate of them) present them not immode-

[b] *De re rustic. l. 2.*

moderate as to the hair of their heads. But as for beards, they wore none. *Adrian* was the first who let his grow, *viz.* to cover his scars. And as for the body of the *Roman* people, History testifies that these (as well as the *Grecians*) let their children, till they came to be of years, nourish their hair to some considerable Length: and then it was the fashion to offer it to some of the Deities they most affected. When this was done, they for the most part cut their hair as often as it began to come to an immoderate length, and would not suffer it to grow to any extravagant dimensions.

Thus you see what was the *Custom* as to mens wearing their hair in respect of *length* or *shortness*. If *φύσις* hath the signification of *Custom* in this place, then you know what the Apostle refer'd to, *viz.* the practise of those Nations which I have set before you. He might rightly say, *Doth not even Custom teach you that if a man have long hair, it is a shame to him?* The *Jews* and *Egyptians* wore moderate hair generally. The sober and gravest among the *Greeks* and *Romans* had neither very Long nor very Short hair, but of a middle size. They

were

were the more *Barbarous Nations* that offended as to this, as the *Scithians*, *Goths* and *Vandals*, &c. who perpetually wore their hair long: and so did the Antient and Savage *Britains*, as *Cæsar* records. The like is observed of the *Wild Irish* by *Giraldus*. And concerning the *Picts* (who were the Old Barbarous and Northern *Britains*) *Vitruvius* testifies they had hair hanging down right, and very long. The old *Saxons*, who at first cut the hair of their heads to the very Skin (as *Sidonius* relates,) afterwards let it grow to an excessive length, so that it came below their shoulders, saith *Witichindus* a *Saxon* Monk quoted by *Camden* in his *Britannia*. *Strabo* saith the same of the Antient *Celtæ*, *Galls*, and *Franks*. And we read that among these Old *Franks* this custom prevail'd so much, that with the Antient Kings of *France*, to be shaven was to be Deposed, or Disabled to reign. And Short Hair became Ignominious and Reproachfully, as is manifest from that *French* Proverb, *Il a perdu ses cheveux*, he hath lost his hair, i. e. his honour; Which arose hence, saith Mr *Howel*, that in the first race of *French* Kings there was a Law that the *Nobles* only

[c] His French Dictionary.

should

should wear Long Hair (it was a thing so prized that they ingrossed it to themselves,) and when any of them were found guilty of a base fact, they were punished with the loss of their hair. This law, which was called *La Loy Chevelue*, was made (saith the same person) by King *Clodion* (he meant *Clovis* the *Hairy*, and was continued till King *Pepin* time, and then disanull'd as a Pagan Constitution. But the people who were in any measure Masters of Civility and Humanity, even among the Heathens, practised otherwise, and (as *Plutarch* testifies) had hair generally of a *decent growth*.

Besides the *Custom* of those Nations which the Apostle had an eye to here, I might adjoyn what the usage of *Others* hath been since. Among the *Turks* all their Slaves are shaved, to shew how Shameful and Vile a thing it is to be destitute of hair; but they likewise shew by their own example that they dislike Long Hair, for they wear the hair of their heads very short. Of their *heads*, I say; for the hair of their *Beards* is Long, in token, as they think, of Freedom. (And here it may be generally observed on the contrary, that those people

ple who suffer the hair of their heads to grow to a great length, have little or no Beards, as if the former made amends for the want of those latter. Thus the Ancient *Britains* (whom I mentioned before) shaved all their Beard away except that growing on the upper lip. The *Chinoise* have thin Beards, consisting of not above twenty or thirty hairs; and they paint a Deformed man with a thick beard. On the other side, it might be observed that there have been Extreams as to *beards*, as well as *the hair of the head*. Some have so nourished them as if they emulated the name of that *Constantine* who was call'd *Pogonatus*, whilest others have so hated them, as if they were a kin to the Apostate *Julian* who stiled himself *Misopogan*. But as the *Mahometans*, who are a *Grave* sort of people, doe not lavishly nourish the hair of their heads, so a Different usage prevails among the *Rude Armenians*, who generally wear their hair Uncut, and as long as it will grow, bound with laces, and hanging down to their heels. Those Extreams on both hands have been carefully avoided by *Christians*, whose Custom likewise I will in some part relate, and so pass to the next General head.

The

The Primitive Saints of the Christian Church, who were so strict and exact in all other things, would not be defective in this. They who refused to comply with the Rites and Fashions of the *Gentiles* (even when some of them were Innocent in Themselves) would not certainly conform to This which was the practise of the Lewdest *Heathens*. A Decent and moderate growth of the hair was thought Commendable rather then Unlawful. And such even *those of Age*, and *of the Ministerial Function* were not averse to, according to that of St *Ambrose*, *Quam reverenda casaries in senibus? quam veneranda in sacerdotibus?* A Moderate head of hair was so far from being blameable in these persons, that it was Reverend and Venerable. But from this Moderation they fell into an Excess. Even the Retired and Contemplative Christians, who betook themselves to a *Monastick* Life, let their hair grow in an Extravagant manner. St *Augustin* calls the Monks of his time, whom he sharply inveighs against, [d] *the Hairy Brethren*: for the Old *Monks* in those days had their hair down to their feet, which was counted a sign of Mortification and Neglect of the world. Where by

[d] *Fratres Crinitos. De opere Monach. cap* 31.

by the way observe that the *Antient Monks* were not *Shaved*, as they are at this day in the Church of *Rome*: for if they were so Luxuriant in their hair, it is not likely that they affected to take it away only on the top of their heads, and to shew their bald crowns. Yea, their *Monks* now are shaved for the same reason that heretofore they let their hair grow to that excessive Length, *viz.* because they would renounce the Ornament and Fashion of the world. *Long Hair* is a sign of affecting Worldly Delight, therefore the Popish Priests shave to tell the world that they were not given to those Vanities. Even the *Nuns* too undergo this discipline, though it is against the *Antient Councils*. [c] If a woman under the pretence of Religion, saith the Council of *Gangra*, shear her hair, which God gave her for a remembrance of her subjection, let her be accursed, as one that hath broken the Command of subjection. And the [t] latter *Decrees* say that a woman cannot be ordain'd, or have Holy Orders either *jure* or *de facto*, and that for this reason, because she must not be *Shaved*. But though the *Romish* rite of Shaving Priests and Nuns, be thus repugnant to their own

[c] Εἴ τις γυναικῶν διὰ τὴν νομιζομένην ἀσκησιν ἀποκείροιτο τὰς κόμας ἃς ἔδωκεν, &c. *Sub Sylvestro.*

[t] *Cap. Uxoratus.*

Orders and Constitutions, and contrary to the Practice before mentioned, yet it is probable it was derived from some Other practise and custom of the Church in former days. And That, as I conceive, was this; the Antient Penitents (as you may read) used to cut their Hair and Beards as soon as they were received again into the Church: and hence might arise the Corrupt Custom of lopping and polling the hair of their heads, and at last it was thought sufficient to shave only one part, as is in use among the Religious Orders of the *Roman Church*. But now I desire you to observe how the *Decent and Moderate wearing of the hair in vien* (which our Apostle aims at here) is authorized and commended by those *Antient* but *Contrary Practises* which I have mentioned. Since suffering the Hair to grow very Long was a mark of Mortification among the Old *Monasticks*, and was reckoned such by some of the *Penitents*, who by their Cutting their hair at their Restitution to the Church shewed that they took up the wearing of Long Hair as a Penance or Punishment; and since on the other side, Cutting the hair and even Shaving have been and are still practised

ſed by ſome men as tokens of Renouncing the world, and acts of Religious Severity, it may be concluded from theſe *Unuſual* and *Extraordinary occurrences* (as I ſaid before in the like caſe) what was the *Uſual* and *Conſtant practice* of the *Chriſtians* in wearing their hair. Theſe things which I have alledged are but Superſtitious derivations from the Stated courſe they obſerved. Wherefore laying aſide theſe Extreams, you know what was the middle way they took.

But I muſt add, that it was not *Superſtition* and *Fond Devotion* only which made *Long Hair* faſhionable among *Chriſtians* at firſt. The Primitive Cuſtom was altered by the irruption of the *Barbarous Nations, viz.* when the *Longobards, Gothes,* and *Vandals* invaded the territories of the Roman Empire. Long Hair began to be worn in theſe *European* parts when thoſe *Long-haird Barbarians* violently broke in upon theſe Countreys, and overrun them. Among other evils and miſchiefs which they were the Authors of, and which they left behind them in theſe parts, This may juſtly be reckoned as one. Before this time the *Chriſtians* generally wore moderately ſhort hair. This is the True Epoche of this Cuſtom among

Christians; and it is a sufficient Disparagement to it that it came in at the same time that Rudeness, Violence and Barbarity entred their quarters. And as it was introduced into *Europe* by *Barbarous people*, so ever since, those who have most of that character are the Admirers and Practisers of it. It would be too tedious to descend to Particular Countries, and shew what effect this hath had. Though this evil usage, brought in by Savage people, prevail'd very much, yet the folly and evil of it was discerned by the Sober and Wise. These constantly, in observance of the *Apostle's Canon* here, wore their hair cut, and moderately short. It was a great while before *Long Hair* began to be Modish with our Christian Ancestors in this Isle. But when it was so, it soon met with a check, for our [s] *Chronicles* acquaint us that it was taken notice of by a Synod of the Clergy in King *Henry* the first's reign, and decreed against; and the King himself, and by his example all his Knights, submitted to the Decree, and cut their hair short. So this Excess was laid aside a great while, and scarcely revived till about Sixty years agoe, when we borrowed from *France* this

[s] Matth. *Westm. A. D.* 1127.

this evil practice, as we have done many others. If a Synod now ſhould follow the example of that before mentioned, and ſhew their diſlike of this general diſorder, it would be an act worthy of them. Thus you have heard what hath been the *Cuſtom* concerning *Long* and *Short Hair*. Now I will paſs from *Cuſtom*, which is ſaid to be a ſecond Nature, to the conſideration of *Nature It ſelf* as it is properly ſo called.

II. Taking φύσις here in a ſtricter ſenſe, i. e. as it ſignifies the *Inward Law of Nature*, or Right Reaſon in our minds, let us ſee whether *This teacheth that a man* ſhould not have *Long Hair*. It is granted, before I go any further, that Long Hair, as it is the product of Nature, as ſuch (I ſay) is not a thing to be condemned; for then it ought to be condemned in Women as well as in Men. It is not to be denied that *Nature* hath given Men long hair as well as the Other Sex, if they will let it grow; as is clear from the inſtances of thoſe men (and I have before informed you that there are and have been ſuch) who ſuffer their hair to grow, and come down as low as their feet. Again, I grant that wearing of Long Hair is not Intrinſecally

Unlawful, and Sinful in It ſelf abſolutely, for what is ſo can never be otherwiſe: but we know that it was Lawful in the *Nazarites*, becauſe it was commanded by God. If Long Hair had been in its intrinſick nature, and immutably ſinful, it could not have been made otherwiſe by God himſelf, and conſequently it could not have been enjoyned by him. Thus you ſee in what ſenſe *Long Hair* is *not* againſt the *Law of Nature*. Having premiſed this (which was requiſite for the underſtanding this matter aright) I will ſhew how it *was* and *is againſt Nature*, or the dictates of Natural Reaſon.

Firſt, you may judge of the Law of Nature by the Practice of men. What do All Nations agree in? How do the Beſt and Wiſeſt of all Countries behave themſelves in this affair? Which way doth the Reaſon of mankind ſteer it ſelf? This you may be ſatisfied in from what hath been ſaid already. The Sobereſt part of the world every where (*Jews* and *Infidels*, as well as *Chriſtians*) wear not their hair at an Extravagant Length. What was the reaſon that the *Stoicks* cut their hair ſo ſhort (as hath been obſerved before?) It was no other then this, that they who were Immodeſt and

Lewd

Lewd wore Long Hair, but those that were Modest and Virtuous and of Good Lives did not. Hence those *Philosophers*, to gain credit and repute with the people, betook themselves to this Better Fashion, yea they ran into another excess, and to avoid Long Hair scarcely left themselves any.---*Supercilio brevior coma.*---saith the [h] *Satyrist* of them, the hair of their head was shorter then that of their eye-brows. Hence their disciples are called [i] *Detonsa juventus*. Thus they did, because Short hair was look'd upon as a sign of Modesty and Chastity, and was in use among those that were most Vertuous. Therefore the Contrary usage, so far as it is against the Practice of the Sobereſt persons, and such as are the greatest masters of Natural Reason, is *against Nature*. So that these *two* first acceptions of the word φύσις run into *One* at last, *Custom* and *Nature* teach the same. You may judge what *Nature* dictates by the *Custom* and Practice of Rational and Sober men.

[h] *Juvenal.*

[i] *Persius.*

Secondly, you may conclude that *Nature* or *Right Reason* forbids the wearing of *Long Hair* to men, because this is against the laws of *Natural Decency* and *Comelinesse*. Observe then that the

Apoſtle here in this Chapter, and even to the end of the 14th corrects the miſcarriages of the *Corinthians* in their publick meetings, and then concludes all thus, [k] *Let all things be done Decently.* Whence I rightly infer, that *Indecency* (which was accompanied with *Diſorder*) was their great fault. Which one thing is a Key to open the meaning of the Text, and acquaints us that *Natural Decency* is to be underſtood here by *Nature.* Which is further confirmed by the words of the Apoſtle in the verſe immediately before This, *Is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?* And from this very notion of *Decency* or *Comelineſs* he continues to argue in theſe words, *Doth not Nature it ſelf teach you*, &c. [*Is it comely?*] and [*Doth not Nature teach you?*] are the ſame. Let us ſee then what this τὸ πρέπον, this *Decorum*, this *Comelineſs* ſignifies. Πρέπειν is to follow the order of Nature in reſpect of Perſons, Place, Time, State or Condition, or any other Circumſtance whatſoever, and to act ſuitably according to the Variety of theſe. And this *Decorum* is to be obſerved in all External Actions, Words, Geſtures and Behaviour. When all theſe are rightly ordered, then a perſon acts *Decently*

[k] ch. 14. laſt v.

cently or *Fitly*: but when theſe are not obſerved, he acts *Unbecomingly*, and what he doth is *Unſeemly* and *Unfitting*. It was thought *Indecent* in grave *Socrates* to be ſeen riding on a Cane, like a little boy. The Senate of *Areopagus*, that Grave and Reverend Judicatory at *Athens*, made this Order, [1] that none of the Judges of that Bench ſhould be permitted to write Comedies. The reaſon was becauſe it was *Unſeemly* and *Indecorous* for thoſe Grave Senators to make Plays. Theſe were not *fit perſons* for ſuch a purpoſe. *Idem manebat, neque idem decebat*, ſaid *Tully* of the famous *Hortenſius*. His way of Oratory and of Action became him in his Youthful years, but it had no Grace in Age. One thing becomes one Time, another another. And ſo this Law of *Congruity* and *Incongruity* runs through all the Circumſtances of a mans life, as might be ſhewed. This is particularly to be diſcerned in the inſtance which is before us: *Short* or *Moderate hair* is a thing *Convenient* and *Seemly* in men, but the contrary is *Unſeemly*, *Incongruous*, *Uncomely*, becauſe it is not ſuitable to the ſtate and condition of *Men*, who ought to do things agreeable to their Rank and Quality,

[1] Μηδένα ποιεῖν κωμῳδίας Ἀρειοπαγίτην. Plutarch.

lity, who ought to shew themselves Manly and Grave, who ought to act their part Wisely, who are convinced that there is no time or place for Extravagancy and Folly, who have natural impressions on their minds to encline them to what is Serious, and who know very well that this Garb we have been speaking of, if it be considered in all its circumstances and with all its appendages, is Inconvenient and Unseemly. This being so, *Christians* of all persons are to avoid that Unseemly wearing of their hair, because they are obliged by the Apostles Injunction to *do all things Decently*, and because the Indecent Length of hair hath at least *an appearance of evil*, which the same Inspired Writer bids them *abstain* from. Thus *Nature teacheth that it is a shame for a man to wear long hair*, and that it is Honest and Decent, and Becoming the Exactness of Christianity to observe a Moderate Length. This in general: but more particularly,

Thirdly, Even *Natural Reason* commends to us the Apostle's advice, to *think on things which are of good report*, Phil. 4. 8. and to *provide things honest in the sight of all men*, Rom. 12. 17. 2 Cor. 8. 21. Now these Rules

can-

cannot be more useful in any case then in the wearing of *Habits*, and of *Hair*. These ought to be such as are generally reputed Honest and Laudable, and have the good word of Sober men. *Tertullian*, it seems, was accused of Lightness and Inconstancy by the people of *Carthage* for laying aside the use of the *Gown* (the common habit of the *Romans*) and putting on the *Cloak* (the usual vestment of the *Grecians*:) but he apologizeth for himself, telling them that he made choice of the *Pallium* as the *Fittest* and *most Becoming Habit*, and which was of *Good Esteem and Repute* among the *Wisest persons*, who are the most Competent Judges of the rules of Decency and Sobriety. It was, saith he, of great *Antiquity*, and so he could not be blamed for affecting Novelty, and wearing an Upstart Habit. Besides, it was a very *Useful* and *Serviceable* sort of apparel, and on that account also it could not but be esteemed Honest and Lawful. Again, among the *Grecians* it was the proper habit of *Philosophers*, who were the Soberest and Antientest persons among them, and therefore was fittest for *Christians*, especially for *Priests*; and it was at that time generally made use of by them:

them: accordingly he wore it as ſoon as he was made *Presbyter* of the Church of *Carthage*, and he is pleaſed to call it a *Prieſts Habit*. Thus he followed thoſe Rules of the Apoſtle exactly. And they are as uſeful and practical in the *Other caſe*, of *wearing the Hair*: which ought to be in that manner which is accounted *Honeſt*, and is *of Good Report*, that is, approved of by the Beſt and Wiſeſt men, that hath the good liking of the Sobereſt and Graveſt Chriſtians, and that is practiſed by them, and not by Ruffians.

Fourthly, *Natural Reaſon* teacheth us that *Long Hair* is unlawful as it is any ways ſubſervient to *Pride*, *Wantonneſs*, and *Effeminacy*. This is true, whether we ſpeak of mens Own Hair, or whether it be Borrowed, and worn in lieu of their Own, as is the common practice of theſe times. I am far from the thinking that the wearing of a *Peruke*, barely conſidered, is Unlawful. There may be occaſion for borrowed hair in caſe of Neceſſity, want of Health, ſome unavoidable Infirmity, or Decay and Loſs of that Natural Covering which they had. But now it is the cuſtom, when neither Health, nor any Other honeſt cauſe can be aſſigned, to clap on a falſe

falſe head of hair, as if *hair were given women for a Covering*, not for themſelves (as the Apoſtle meant it,) but for Men. But this Needleſs uſe of falſe hair is not all that is to be blamed in the men of this age. They are yet more guilty, for they affect an *Extravagant Length* of hair, which is the fruit of *Unmanly Vanity* and *Pride*, I will not ſay in *all*, but in *many* that uſe it. This Effeminate garb doth generally betray a weak and infirm mind; it is a ſign of a want of other and better Head-Furniture. Commonly it is attended with an immoderate love of Softneſs and Delicacy. When they thus Extravagantly load themſelves with Womans hair, they become Wanton and Luxurious, Soft and Womaniſh. Theſe are none of *Samſon's* breed, their *Strength* lies not in their *Locks*, yea they are made feeble and effeminate by them. Theſe Wanton Labels are in the generality of perſons that wear them as noted marks of this diſgrace, as a *Fillet* in Heraldry is of effeminacy, and as *Guſſets* and a *Goar ſiniſter* are ſigns there of Cowardize and Womaniſh diſpoſition.

Fifthly, it might be added that ſo far as *Long Hair* may prove *Incommodious* and

and *Cumberſome*, and be a Hindrance to men in their Buſineſs (which they beſt know and are ſenſible of whoſe heads are hung with this *Troubleſome Tackle*) it muſt needs be pronounced to be *againſt Nature*, and the Law of our Rational faculties, for this approves of nothing which really Incommodes us, and is an impediment to us in any of the neceſſary offices of our lives. If a Reſolute Vanity did not poſſeſs theſe mens minds, and ſtrangely harden them, they would count thoſe *Ell-Wiggs* an intolerable Luggage, and would beg to be rid of them. They would complain that theſe hang in their way, and even impede their Eating and Drinking, the greateſt buſineſs of their lives. Or, if we could imagine this ſort of perſons to be *Warriours*, they would then certainly feel the miſchief of this Incumbrance which they carry about them, and we ſhould ſoon ſee them leave theſe *Horſe-Tails* to the Enemy as the *Enſigns* and Trophies of their folly.

Laſtly, the *Natural Law of Reaſon* bids men doe nothing that is *Shameful* and *Opprobious*, *Diſgraceful* and *Diſhonourable*; but ſuch is a mans *having of Long Hair*. It is, ſaith the Apoſtle, a

ſhame

ſhame to him; or rather, it ſhould have been tranſlated *diſhonour*, for it is ἀτιμία in the Greek, and is oppoſed to δόξα in the next verſe, which ſhews this rendring of the word to be moſt proper. If a man wear long hair, it is a *Diſhonour* to him, it being doing that which is unworthy of his *peculiar Sex*, and ſo is *Unnatural*: which leads me to the next Particular which I propounded. But before I enter upon That, I will ſumm up the foregoing heads, that you may at one view diſcern how *Nature* (i. e. Natural Reaſon, which dictates what is Good and what is Bad) *teacheth* the Unlawfulneſs of *Long Hair*, *viz.* As it is againſt the Judgement and Practice of the Sobereſt race of men in all Regions of the world, as it is againſt Natural Decency and Comelineſs, as it is a thing not of Good Report, ſo far as it may ſerve to Pride and Lewdneſs, ſo far as it may prove an Impediment, and laſtly, as it is a Diſgrace and Diſhonour to the Sex. Theſe things being thus, I cannot excuſe the Learned [m] *Salmaſius*, who declares that *Length of Hair* in men is free from all fault and blame, and that their Longeſt Locks are not againſt the Apoſtles κανών. This is one Extream:

[m] *De Comâ.*

the

the other is maintained by *Poimenander*, who looks upon this Text as a kind of *Depilatory* Text. So far is this *Dutch Divine* from approving of *Salmasius's* Long Locks, that he will not suffer a mans hair to reach any further then his ears. It must only cover his Skull, he saith in another place. And at last he tells us that to wear hair below the ears is such a sin as deserves Eternal Death. But may we not ask this Damning man, What is the Hair of the head for? If it be not of *some Length* and *Thickness*, it is not for use, and so Nature gave it in vain. Is it not agreed on by all the Understanding part of mankind, that the Hair of the head was given to cover it from the cold, and to guard and shelter it from the winds, or other assaults? And is it possible it should do this if it be so Clipp'd and Poll'd as some would have it? No: this design of Nature cannot be accomplished. It is granted likewise by all men of sober thoughts, that *Nature* intended the Hair of the head to be a *Comely Adorning* to it, which it cannot be if it be not permitted to display it self in some measure, especially if it be reduced to that Low Cut which was mentioned before. Here

then

then we are concerned to avoid *Extreams* on one ſide or other. As a man muſt not go like a *Nazarite*, or a *Greek Philoſopher*, or like a *Nebuchadnezzar* at graſs with his hair hanging down about him, ſo neither muſt he appear like a *Shorn Animal* with a bare Skull, like an *Affrighted Jew* in his days of Mourning with his hair torn off, like a *Cropt Synick*, or like a *Shaven Monk*. But there is a *Decent Medium* to be prefer'd before theſe, and to be practiſed, that is, to wear the hair with a Convenient Shortneſs, or a moderate Length, call it which you will. This matter is eaſily decided by peaceable and ſober minds, though ſome have made a great Controverſie of it, inſomuch that it hath been called *Bellum Capillare*. This is certain, that no man can preſcribe a Juſt Exact Meaſure, a Preciſe Length: for this may alter according to the age, temper, and quality of the perſon, yea even according to the dimenſions of his neck. We muſt not be Curious here, we muſt not be Cenſorious and Quarrelſom, we muſt not create Scruples and Difficulties. Any Sober and well Conſiderate man, who makes his *Reaſon* his Rule, will eaſily determine in this affair.

III. *The Difference of Sexes*, which is another ſignification of the word φύσις, teacheth that if a man have *Long Hair*, it is a ſhame and diſhonour to him: for wearing the hair in a Different manner is one badg of the *Sex*. Difference of Habits diſtinguiſhes one Sex from another: accordingly *Hair*, which is a ſort of *Habit*, is a diſtinction of the Sexes. Firſt, the hair of the face which we call *Beards*, is as it were the *Clothing* of the face. Some indeed have pulled theſe up by the roots, or ſhaved the place very cloſe, as many of the *Greeks* and *Romans* uſed to do: but others let them grow, and that to a conſiderable length, as the Old Philoſophers generally did. *Adrian* the Emperour (as we have noted before) was the firſt that brought among the *Romans* the faſhion of Beards: before that time they uſually had no hair on their chins or lips. But this practice is againſt *Nature*, it taking away that which is one *Diſtinction between the Sexes*. Hence God forbad his people not only to *round* (i. e. to ſhave all round) *the corners of their heads*, but to *mar the corners of their beards*, Lev. 19. 27. This latter, *viz.* the ſpoiling of the angles of the Beard by cut-

cutting all off round, ſeems to be repugnant to *Nature*, and conſequently is as *Shameful* as the former. And there is nothing to excuſe the general cuſtom at this day among us of ſhaving off the Beard, and going with Smooth Chins like women, but this, that the Cutting or Not cutting of the Beard is not ſo Great a Diſtinction of the Sexes as the ordering of the Hair of the Head: for both men and women are furniſhed with Hair on their heads, but ſeveral people in the world are without Beards, that is, no hair grows on their faces. And beſides, this *Beardleſs faſhion* is the more tolerable, as long as the *Other Differences* of the Sexes, *viz.* Clothes of the body, and Hair of the head are kept up. And therefore it appears hence that we ought to be the more concerned for this latter. By the Hair of the Head there is a plain diſcrimination made between Man and Woman. And yet I do not ſay that *ſimply* and *abſolutely* ſpeaking, it is a Diſtinction inſtituted by *Nature*, becauſe Nature hath made the Hair of Male and Female alike. Though a *Beard* ſeems to be a Natural Diſtinction, yet *the Hair of the Head* is not. But then This is to be ſaid, that it is *Natural* to

diſtinguiſh the Sexes, and the Wearing of the *Hair* being through cuſtom agreed upon among all Nations to be one Diſtinction between the Sexes, it follows that it is Natural and Reaſonable to obſerve this Diſtinction. Now if a Man wear his hair as long as a Woman, the Sex is not diſcerned, which is againſt the Law and Decree of Nature, *viz.* that the Diſtinction of Sexes is to be maintained, and not confounded. The very ſumm of the firſt part of This Chapter to the *Corinthians* is, that Women muſt not be forgetful of their *Sex*. There is a Modeſty and Shamefac'dneſs proper to them, as the conſequent of the Subjection they owe, which is to be ſhew'd by putting on a *Veil*. Though they had Supernatural Gifts (as the Apoſtle here ſuppoſeth,) yet they were to remember their peculiar ſtation and Sex. And ſo here the ſame thing is urged, *viz.* the *Difference of Sexes* made by God and Nature. This teacheth the man that it is Unfit for him to wear *Long Hair*, for hereby the Difference of Sexes would be taken away. We muſt not do things contrary to or unbecoming our Sex. That is Decorous and Seemly in a Man which is not in a Woman, and

ſo

ſo *vice verſâ*. It muſt needs then be a ſhame to a Man to have hair of the Length which a Woman hath: for then he is truly *Traveſtie*, dreſſed in anothers Clothes, (which is the import of that French word,) and for which he may be juſtly *Ridicul'd*. And This certainly is the *Shame* of This Age wherein we live, Though it is not ſo accounted, but rather, the Contrary is thought Shameful and Diſgracefull. We may in our days alter and tranſpoſe the Apoſtle's words, and ſay, *If a man hath Short hair, it is a Shame to him: but if a woman have Short hair, nay, if ſhe hath none, it is a Glory to her*. That Sex which uſed not to nouriſh the hair, now doth, or rather makes uſe of the hair which others ſhould nouriſh: and the Other Sex which uſed to have their hair at the utmoſt Length, now cut it off and give it to the man. It is true, ſtill the Diſtinction of the Sexes is preſerved, though the *Marks* and *Badges* of it be Contrary to what they were heretofore. But notwithſtanding this, here is a Perverting and Confounding of the Natural and Primitive Order, a caſting off the received Tokens which uſed to diſtinguiſh the Sexes of man and woman. Thus you ſee how *Nature it*

ſelf teacheth that if a man have Long hair, it is a ſhame to him.

Hitherto I have conſidered the word κομᾶν in the *firſt ſenſe*, i.e. as it denotes *having Long hair*, or Looſe hair which hangeth down at length, and is without any Artificial Ornament. But as *This* is a frequent ſignification of the word, ſo there is *another*, *viz.* to have hair not only Long and Uncut, but to *diſpoſe of it after the manner of Women*, to *deck* and *adorn it*. This is a known ſignification of the Greek word in the Text: yea, ſome will have this to be the Primary and Proper denotation of the word κομᾶν. Here then I will examine, 1. What this κομᾶν was, wherein conſiſted the *wearing of hair like Women*, in reſpect of its Dreſs and Ornament? 2. Whether the Apoſtle *here* means Hair of this kind? 3. How *Nature teacheth* men that they ought not to wear ſuch hair?

I. What is it *to wear hair like women?* For we ſhall not be able to tell what *men are taught* to do when they are forbid to *have ſuch hair*, unleſs we know firſt what that hair was, *viz.* in regard of its Compoſure and Dreſs. You muſt know then, that women did not

wear

wear their hair at Length, though it was Long, for they tied it up, and to this purpose made use of fillets, laces, ribbands. And they did not truss and wrap up their hair confusedly, but ordered it into several divisions: and accordingly they had Pins to divide the hair. It is no small piece of Learning to be acquainted even with the *Attire of Women* from the Antienteſt Writers. From them we may learn that all the *Greek* and *Roman*, yea and all *European* women bound up their hair in a handsome manner. It is true, at Funerals, and when Extraordinary Grief surprized them, they let their hair down about their shoulders, but from this custom alone it is clear that at *Other times* they wore it after another fashion, that is, they neatly tied it up one way or other, and suffered it not to hang down disheveld. Yea, they gathered it sometimes into a knot on the top of their heads: the *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Roman* women wore their hair thus. And it is probable this fantastick *Top-knot* of their own hair is taken notice of and reproved by St *Paul* in 1 *Tim.* 2. 9. where he tells us that the Christian women must not be adorned ἐν πλέγμασιν, which we tran-

ſlate [*with broidred hair,*] but the word πλόγμα among the *Greeks* ſignified that *Curled Lock* or *Tower* which the women wore on the top of their heads, and by the *Latins* was call'd *Corymbus.* This you may ſatisfie your ſelves in from the beſt *Lexicographers.* But though this was a Particular uſe of the word among the *Greeks*, yet here it may have a Larger meaning, and ſignifie alſo the Other exceſſes and follies the women were then guilty of in dreſſing their hair. This is elegantly called in *Iſai.* 3. 24. מַעֲשֶׂה מִקְשָׁה *calamiſtri opus*: there was a great deal of *Workmanſhip* in that effeminate dreſſing of the hair, it was an *Elaborate* piece of art to diſpoſe and order it aright. Accordingly from the word κόμη comes the verb κομίζειν, *crines ornare*, which the Greeks expreſs likewiſe by the word ἐμπλέκειν, which is akin to that I before named: whence you may gueſs what πλόγμαλα are, in the more comprehenſive ſenſe of the word. We render it (as I have ſaid) by [*broidred hair,*] but I conjecture the word is falſly ſet down, by the fault of the Printers 'tis likely. *Broided* is the word uſed by *Coverdale* and *Tindal* here, whence our Laſt Tranſlators took it, but in Tranſcribing or Prin-

Printing it was corrupted: which ought to be taken notice of by those who have the Inspection of these things in our Church, that we may not make use of a false and mistaken Version, for [*Broidred*] was mistook for [*broided*, or *braided*] (for both these words were heretofore in use.) Now, *braiding the hair* is the same with ἐμπλοκὴ τριχῶν, *plaiting the hair*, which is forbid by St *Peter*, 1 *Epist.* 3. ch. 3. v. Though the hair might be put up decently, yet it was not to be *braided* or *plaited*; by which word, and by that other before named, all Lust and Wantonness in Trimming the head is condemned by those two Apostles. The *Magnasheh Miksheh*, the *well-set hair*, the laborious Curling, Frizling and Crisping the hair, which was then in use, and all other Gaudy and Wanton Dressing of it are here pronounced Unlawful, and not fit to be practised by women professing Christianity. The short then is, that Women heretofore did always wear their hair *Uncut*, and because of its *Length* they did not suffer it to hang about their ears, but tied it up, and decently disposed of it: but at last this Decent Ordering of their hair degenerated into an Indecent

Trim-

Trimming, into a Lewd and Wanton Garnishing it. It is the former of these which is expressed here in this one word κομᾶν. This signifies the Womanish Setting forth and Adorning of the hair, the wearing of hair as Women wear it. The *Grammarians* in the propriety and differences of words which they make, tell us that κόμη is properly of Women, as θρίξ & τρίχωμα of Men. *Coma est capillus aliquâ curâ compositus*, say the Masters of Grammer and Criticism. And accordingly some of them derive it from κομεῖν *curare, colere, ornare*, to take care of, trim, deck, adorn. Therefore κόμη is *Womens hair* properly, because it requires great Care and Art to keep it, dress it, and tie it up. So κομᾶν is to be carefull about the hair, decently to gather it together, and to dispose of it: whence Loose and Squalid hair is opposed in all Good Authors to κόμη, & κομᾶν. Thus I have done with the First Demand, what *the wearing of hair like women* is.

II. I am to shew you that the Apostle speaks here of *This very wearing of hair*. The κομᾶν which is mentioned twice together (in this, and the next verse) is meant of the same thing: this will not be

be denied, I ſuppoſe. Now the latter κομᾶν, applied to the *woman*, cannot be meant of *Long Hair* only and ſimply, but alſo of hair which is Ordered and Faſhioned according to the uſe of women: and that for theſe two Reaſons. Firſt, becauſe it is ſaid to be her *Glory*: but tis well known that Hair Hanging down and Diſheveld is no *Glory*, no Ornament, no Honour, and never was thought to be to any of that Sex. When the Apoſtle ſaith, *If a woman doth* κομᾶν, *it is a glory to her*, he cannot intend Long Hair abſolutely, and ſolely, for that was no *Comlineſs* or *Decorum*, much leſs, *Glory* to the *Greek* or *Roman*, or any *European* women, but on the contrary, it was thought Indecent, and was a ſign of Negle&tulneſs and Squalidity, and therefore uſed in caſe of great Mourning and Lamentation. Secondly, in this ſame verſe it is ſaid that the womans hair *is given her* [b] *for a Covering*. Hence then I gather that this κόμη muſt not be mere Long Hair hanging down, and never cut. This indeed covers the neck and ſhoulders, but it is no more a *Covering to the head* then ſhort or Cut hair. Therefore it muſt be meant not only of hair worn at Length, but of the Bind-

[b] ἀντὶ περιβολαίου, *pro velamine.*

Binding up the hair in an Artificial manner, to do the ſervice of a *Veil*, and in the way of a real *Covering* to the head. When it is tied up, and in ſeveral parts made up together, and faſtned to the head, it is a *Covering*, whereas if it hang at Length, and be Looſe and Flowing, it is not a *Covering*, or if it be one, it is as much a Covering to the other parts of the body as to the head. The Apoſtle would have women cover or veil their *heads*, with their own Hair; and he intimates at the ſame time that this *Natural Covering* dictates what they ſhould do moreover, that is, add an *Artificial one*, a *Veil* over their heads, as often as they go into the publick Aſſemblies, and are ingaged in ſolemn acts of Religion and Worſhip. God giving them the *Veil of Hair*, and by that as it were tells them they muſt be covered with *another*. They are to have a Double Covering; one Nature ſupplies them with, Art muſt afford the other: and if they caſt off this latter, they may as well caſt off the former. This you find to be the Apoſtle's way of arguing (whatſoever you think of it) in the beginning of the Chapter, where he acquaints the Chriſtian women of *Corinth*, that *praying*

ing with their heads uncovered is even all one as if they were ſhaven: and accordingly he adds, *If a woman be not covered, let her alſo be ſhorn. Nature* doth as it were ſhew the way in this caſe, and lets women know that they muſt cover their heads in time of Divine Worſhip. Why ſo? Becauſe Nature hath given them Hair *for a Covering:* it tells them they muſt have a *Veil.* But what kind of Hair is this? It is Long Hair, but not hanging at length, it is gather'd and tied up, and made as it were into a *Cap* or *Covering* for the head. It is evident then that the Apoſtle here ſpeaks againſt thoſe *Corinthian* men who were Effeminate and Wanton, who at that time wore their hair after the manner of Women, who artificially wrapt it up, and dreſſed and adorned it after the faſhion of that Sex. The Apoſtle forbids the Men to wear their hair thus: this is κόμη, *coma*, properly ſo called, and belongs to a *Woman.* This Gathering and Tying, and Adorning the hair is the womans Natural Veil or Covering for her head, and given her to that purpoſe. Κομᾶν is her proper Ornament, and is even ſtiled by the Apoſtle, her *Glory*, as hath been often ſaid. But this, as lawful as it is

in

in Women, becomes Unlawful and Sinful in the Masculine Sex. If a Man makes use of it, ἐὰν κομᾷ, *If he wears his hair like a woman*, i. e. Gathered up, and Composed by art, it is a *shame* to him. Not only *Long Hair* but *Adorned Hair* is not permitted to Man, but is *against Nature*. Which is the

III. thing I am to undertake, *viz.* to shew how *Nature teacheth* that a Man ought not to wear his hair after this manner. And here we will take the word φύσις in the *Tripple* sense which we took it in before, *viz.* as it signifies *Custom*, *Natural Reason*, and *Difference of Sex*. First, it is not to be denied that many Men among the *Gentiles* went with the Attire of their Hair like Women. It is easily proved out of History that the *Grecian* Men kept their hair uncut and unpoll'd, and were very vain and wanton in dressing it. They used to perfume, cut and crisp their hair, and to take a great deal of care about it. Yea, the *Spartans* went even to the Wars with their hair artificially combed and adorned. The *Corinthians*, among other *Grecians*, degenerated into this effeminate wearing of their hair, which the Apostle here reproves them for. But among the *Athenians*

nians particularly a Knot of hair tied up, and ſtanding upright on their crowns was the univerſal faſhion even among the Men. This was called by them κρόβυλος & πλόκιμος: this latter word is uſed (as you have heard) by the Apoſtle, and perhaps refers particularly to this faſhion. It was alſo called σκόρπιος, a *Scorpion*, becauſe perhaps it was partly framed in the figure of a *Scorpion* or *Snake*; it twirled about like ſuch an animal, for which reaſon alſo a *Curled Lock* of hair is called a *Worm* in our modern ſtile. *Salmaſius* hath proved from *Lucian*, *Virgil*, and other Authors that this *Top-Lock* or *Curl'd Tuft* of hair on the crown of the head was the faſhion of Other Nations beſides the *Greeks*. This and other exceſſes of the like kind were uſed by the Men among the *Romans* alſo, as appears from thoſe Writers who took notice of them, and inveighed againſt them. *Ovid* jerks thoſe Effeminate Men who will not let a hair be amiſs or out of its place,

Quiſque ſuas ponunt in ſtatione comas.

[a] *Juvenal* corrects the pride of the *Roman* Gallants in wearing their hair finely dreſſed; and [b] *Horace* laſhes them for the

[a] *Sat.* 8.

[b] *Lib.* 2. *Ode* 5.

the ſame Effeminacy. Nay, not only the Jeering Poets took notice of their Luxury and Extravagancy in this point, but the Graveſt Moraliſts thought it a diſorder fit to be animadverted on and ſeverely reproved. Thus *Seneca* gallantly reproves the *Roman* Vanity of being Delicate and Curious about their Hair: he checks them for ſpending ſo many hours under the Barber's hands, he repreſents how Angry they were with him if he did not do what they would have him, if their Set of Points did not hang right, if any the leaſt Curl were out of order: they had rather the Commonwealth ſhould be troubled and diſordered then their Hair. In ſhort, he rebukes them for being ſo buſie between the Glaſs and the Comb, and tells them it is a ſign they have a greater deſire to be Spruce and Fine then Honeſt. But *Pagans* were not the only perſons that were infected with this folly. The Author of the [q] *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions* ſaith, It is not lawful to nouriſh the hair, and to tie it up in a knot, nor to curl and criſp it, ſeeing the Law forbids it. From whence it appears that this Vanity and Luxury of compoſing the hair in a Womaniſh manner was crept in even among

[q] *Lib.* 1. *cap.* 3.

mong *Christian Men.* And this further appears from that Antient Canon of the 4th Councel of *Carthage*, *Clericus nec comam nutriat, nec barbam*, which was made against the *Massaliani*, a sort of Hereticks then in *Africa* who indulged an Effeminate wearing of their Hair, of whom likewise [r] *Epiphanius* and S^t [t] *Augustin* speak. But though this Vitious practice spread it self among *Pagans* and *Christians*, yet it did not Universally prevail, it was no *General Custom.* That it was not so among the *Pagans* is evident from the Reproofs which it met with from the Sober and Grave among them, yea, from the Witty and Facetious. And that it obtained not among *Christians* is manifest, because it is checked here by the *Apostle* as a single miscarriage of the Christians of *Corinth*: and *Councels*, *Fathers* and *Doctors* have reproved it in their Decrees, Sermons and Discourses, as the fault of *some* only. The short is, there were two Contrary Practises or Customs on foot at that time, one of the Rude and Debauched part of the world, the other of the Better and Civilized sort of people; now, we cannot think that the Apostle appeals here to the Custom of the former,

[r] *Hæres.* 80.

[t] *De opere monach. cap.* 31.

but of the latter: for we cannot imagine that this Holy Man would propound the Worſt of men as an example to the Chriſtians of *Corinth* to ſollow. Whence we may certainly infer that he doth not mean here the Cuſtom of the Rude and Immoral, but of the Civil part of mankind. He tells the *Corinthians* that if they will conduct their lives by the uſual practiſe of theſe, they may be ſufficiently furniſhed with Examples, all the Reformed part of the world act after this manner, that is, they deteſt the Womaniſh wearing of their hair. The Modeſt, Wiſe and Sober in all Nations and in all Ages have oppoſed this practice, it being diſagreeable to the dictates of Reaſon in all underſtanding and conſiderate perſons. Which brings me to the next Particular.

Secondly, *Nature it ſelf*, i. e. the dictate of Natural Reaſon, Natures inſtinct and Common Senſe teach this, that a Man is not to wear hair like a Woman. The Manly Sex is forbid by the Law of Nature to have hair after the manner of the Female ſex. Natural Reaſon dictates againſt *Adorned Hair in men* on the ſame accounts that it was againſt their *Long Hair, viz.* becauſe it is

Inde-

Indecent, becauſe it is of no Good Report, becauſe it is ſubſervient to Pride and Wantonneſs, becauſe it is contrary to the Practiſe of thoſe who are moſt guided by the conduct of Reaſon, *&c.* But I will inſiſt only on the firſt of theſe, the *Natural Indecency* of the thing. Here then, as before, we are to take notice that there is a Decency and Fitneſs to be obſerved and followed by all that own either Reaſon or Religion, There is [1] חֲדְרַת קֹדֶשׁ the *Beauty* of *Comlineſs of Holineſs*, which more immediately reſpects *the Worſhip of God*, but there is alſo the *Pulchritude and Decour of Holineſs* to be obſerved in all the actions which relate to Religion, or are done by Holy men, for theſe do nothing that is Uncomely and Indecorous. All thoſe things which our Apoſtle preſcribes the *Corinthian* Chriſtians concerning *Virginity* and *Marriage* throughout the whole 7th chap. of his 1 Epiſtle to them, he tells them he *ſpeaks* πρὸς τὸ εὐσχημον, *for that which is Comely*, i. e. that a *Decent* and *Fit behaviour* might be kept in all they did. Again, in *Phil.* 4. 8. he commends to them *whatſoever things are honeſt*; but the Greek σεμνὰ ſignifies *Venerable, Grave, Comely.* And ſo that of the fa-

[1] *Pſ.* 96. 10 & 110. 3.

mous Roman Orator is true, [u] That which is Decent is Honeſt, and whatever is Honeſt is Decent. Thus when the Apoſtle joyns *Godlineſs* and *Honeſty* together in 1 *Tim.* 2. 2. the latter word in the [x] Greek may denote that *Grave* and *Decent* deportment of life which I am ſpeaking of. Religion regards Civility, Chriſtianity concerns it ſelf in a Sober, Decent, and Orderly carriage, in a Modeſt and Reverent behaviour. What is ſaid of women in *Tit.* 2. 3. is to be applied to both ſexes, they are to be ἐν καταστήματι ἱεροπρεπεῖς, *in behaviour as becometh holineſs.* The vulgar Latin renders it in *habitu Sancto,* as if κατάστημα were the ſame with καταστολὴ, 1 *Tim.* 2. 9. It is certain that word ſignifies not only Geſture, Countenace, Speech, and the whole Behaviour of perſons, but their *Habit* alſo, *viz.* as this word denotes the *Outward Dreſs.* This is to be regulated by thoſe of the *Maſculine kind* in a ſpecial manner. *Man* was made for Buſineſs and Manly Employment: therefore a kind of Careleſsneſs and [y] Neglect in reſpect of Beauty and Dreſs doth become him. He muſt not ſtudy to be Fine and Delicate: it is not agreeing with his work. To tie up the hair, and

[u] *Quod decet honeſtum eſt, & quod honeſtum eſt, decet.* Cic.

[x] σεμνότης.

[y] *Firma viros neglectа decet.*--- Ovid.

to

to trim and adorn it, and to compoſe it by art, in brief to wear it as a Woman doth, is Unbecoming a man. Thus *Nature* or Natural Reaſon teacheth that *Adorned hair in men* is Indecent and Unfitting, and in plain terms Sinful and Unlawful.

Thirdly, *Nature*, i. e. the *Difference of ſexes* dictates that a Man ought not to wear his Hair in the faſhion of a Woman. The Learned *Salmaſius*, who underſtands by φύσις the *Diſtinction of ſexes*, or that Law of Nature which teacheth there ſhould be a Difference made between the Sexes, hath ſufficiently proved this Acception of the word. I need not therefore repeat here what I ſaid before, that *Nature* is taken in Good Writers in this ſenſe: That I think is unqueſtionable. Now I am only to prove that the Diſtinction which is between the two Sexes is ſufficient foundation for This Prohibition, *viz.* that a man ſhould not wear his hair as women do. You muſt conſider then that there are actions and deportments Proper to each Sex, the very make and Conſtitution of the Sexes dictating theſe Peculiar and Proper operations. Τὸ πρέπον in general is that which is conſentaneous to our Nature, and diſtin-

guiſheth us from Other ſpecies of beings. But in particular this *Decorum* is that which is peculiar and appropriated to one or the other Sex. There are certain boundaries which part both Sexes. That which is decent in one is not ſo in the other, and never can be. It is true *Plato* would have Women train'd up to Martial Exerciſe and feats of Arms, that, if there ſhould be neceſſity, they might defend their Country. But this was a Fanciful project of the Philoſopher, as many of his are: and others of his Brethren Philoſophers were aſhamed of it. One Sex muſt not incroach on the other, and uſurp the rights and uſages proper to it. As (to approach to the matter which is before us) there is a Particular Habit and Dreſs which belongs to Women, and there is another which is proper to Men: and that Habit which doth become the former, doth in no wiſe become the latter, and ſo *vice verſâ*. The Law of God which was given to the *Jews* by *Moſes* poſitively aſſerts this Diſtinction of Habits, and ſtrictly forbids that people to diſguiſe themſelves in the promiſcuous Garments of either Sex. See their *Diſtinct Veſtments* commanded by God in *Deut.* 22. 5. *Philo* giving the

the Reaſon of this Law ſaith, "The Mo-
"ſaick Law takes care of the Habit of
"man and woman, forbidding the former
"to wear what belongs to the other,
"that not the leaſt footſtep or ſhadow
"of Effeminacy might diſparage the
"Maſculine kind. And again, he ſaith,
"[a] The Man ought to wear no Garment
"that is a badg of Unmanlineſs. For
"(as he adds) [b] the Law follows Na-
"ture, and obſerves and enjoyns what
"is Proper and Fitting for all perſons
"even in the leaſt things. This Fit-
tingneſs firſt introduced, and ever ſince
hath kept up a Diſtinction of Habit or
Dreſs in the Sexes. All the Wiſe and
Sober men of the World have approved
of this as a *Law of Nature*, and have
ſharply rebuked thoſe that violated it.
Thus we are told [c] that when *Ariſtotle*
beheld a youth finely trickt up, and in
a dreſs very effeminate, he upbraided
him in theſe words, Art thou not aſha-
med, when Nature hath made thee a
Man, to make thy ſelf a Woman? The
Poets indeed acquaint us that *Hercules*
for *Omphale*'s ſake put on womans ap-
parel, and ſpun, uſing the Diſtaff inſtead
of his Club: and *Achilles*, to avoid the
wars, diſguiſed himſelf in a Female dreſs.

[z] Ἐρεῖκα τῷ μηδὲν ἴχνος ἢ σκιὰν ἀνδρὸς μόνον τῷ θήλεος ἀπὸ λύμης τῆς ἄρρενος γενεᾶς προσάψασθαι. *De Fortitudine.*

[a] Ὀφείλειν μηδὲν ἔχειν ἀναγδρείας ὕπουνμα. *Ibid.*

[b] Βάλεται γὰρ ἐπόμενος ἀεὶ τῇ φύσει τὰ οἰκεῖα καὶ συνῳδὰ ἀλλήλοις ἄχρι τῶν ἐσχάτων. *Ibid.*

[c] Stobæus *in Serm.* 161.

This was indulged as a Shift for a time; But no men of Sober Morals among the Gentiles allow'd of this Change of Habit as an uſual practiſe. *Seneca* repreſents their ſenſe when he ſpeaks thus to his friend, "[a] Do not thoſe men live againſt "*Nature* (the very thing in the Text) "who change their own habit for that "which belongs to the other Sex? This Interrogatory is a flat Negative, and it is as much as if he had ſaid, theſe men do abſolutely confront Nature, and defie its Laws. The Poet who ſaid,

[a] *Non videntur tibi contra Naturam vivere qui commutant cum fœminis veſtem? Ad* Lucil. *Ep.* 123.

Quem præſtare poteſt mulier galeata pudorem
Quæ fugit à ſexu? (*rem*,

was of the like opinion as to *Women*, *viz.* that they cannot without putting off Shame and Modeſty put on the apparel of Men. And if *Jews* and *Gentiles* have thus declared their ſentiments as to this particular, you may expect that *Chriſtians* have not been behind them. It was the peremptory determination of the Councel of *Gangra* that a woman is not to wear mens clothes, nor a man the womans. And there have been other Laws made by the Church, and alſo by the Secular Magiſtrates to refrain diſorder in this kind. For they thought that

that a Fitting and Distinct Dress is a good guard of Honesty, is serviceable to promote Modesty and Shamefac'dness, and to hinder the violating of Chastity. Briefly, All Nations and Countries have observed this Distinction, and accordingly have had Proper and Distinct Garments for the Sexes. This was pursuant of what our Apostle here saith, that *Nature teaches this*, i. e. Nature which distinguisheth the Sexes, Nature which hath every where made a Discrimination between Male and Female, Nature which makes a Difference not only as to Clothes of the body, but as to the manner of wearing the Hair of the head: for the Hair both of the Head and Beard is a Natural Clothing, and is rightly called by *Salmasius*, *altera vestis*. The Difference of Men and Women ought to be manifested by this very Clothing. The Different wearing of the *Hair* distinguisheth the *Sexes*. Nature which hath made a Difference between male and female, dictates also that they are to be Differenced as to This.

But you will say, Nature teacheth not the way of Differencing the Sexes by the wearing of *Hair*, for All People agree not as to the manner of wearing it.

it. In some Countries the woman is distinguished from the man by having Short hair, and the man from the woman by Long Hair tied up, and never cut. I Answer, 1. The practice of *some* Nations and people as to this thing is no Argument. It is sufficient that the *Generality* of the Best and most Moralized people observe This manner of distinction between the Sexes, which I have proved they do. 2. I have before proved that there is something of *Natural Decency* and Fitness in distinguishing the Sexes by this Particular Manner of wearing the hair. 3. Though I should say with *Salmasius*, that Nature teacheth not the Particular way of differencing the Sexes as to Hair, yet this I must say, that when *Custom* and *Institution* have settled such a Particular way, *Nature* then teacheth us to observe it, it bids us not break the Distinction, but keep it up. We see there are Different Usages and Customs in different Countries, but there is Honesty or Dishonesty in the observing several of them, though they be Different, yea almost Contrary. Good and Laudable *Customs* are a *Law* in many places; they are so in This Land: and Reason, which is the Law of Nature,

ture, teacheth us to obſerve theſe. Say then that This of the Text was a Local Cuſtom only, ſay that it was a Temporary Precept (as there are ſeveral ſuch in St *Paul*'s Epiſtles,) calculated only for ſuch a place and certain time, yet the Precept nearly concerns us. For though we are not *immediately* obliged to this Individual and Particular thing, yet becauſe the *Reaſon of the Precept* obliges us, we are on that account, though more *remotely*, ingaged to obſerve this very thing. On this conſideration [e] *Salmaſius* himſelf grants that it is a Sin in a man to wear his hair as Women do. And although ſome of theſe things which the Apoſtle mentions in the beginning of this Chapter, as *mens being uncovered*, to denote their Superiority, and the *womens Covering their heads* as a ſign of their Subjection, together with the Particular Manner of wearing the hair uſed at that time, which the Apoſtle refers to, be not in uſe with us at this day, yet the *General Rule* of keeping up *a Difference between the Sexes* is ſtill valid and obligatory, and will always be ſo. This is certain and fixed, and never to be ſhaken, that Nature hath made a Difference between the Sexes, and that it is

[e] *De Comâ.*

a

a Sin to confound them. And it is not to be denied that this Difference of Sexes is to be manifested by Different Habit and Apparel, to which appertain Wearing the Hair. And this in the times of the *Apostle* was after this manner; Hair hanging down, and moderately cut was proper to Man, and Long Hair, but tied up and with some art disposed was proper to the Woman; for the difference of Men and Womens hair consisted not only in the Length, but in the Disposing and Dressing of it. It is Manly to cut the hair, and neglect the adorning of it: it is Womanish to let it grow, to gather it up orderly and with some innocent art. This is the *Difference of Sexes* made by the *Hair* which St *Paul* speaks of. This is that which was suggested by the Author of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, speaking of that Law in *Leviticus*, *Thou shalt not round the corners of thy head*, &c. 'It behoveth us, saith he, not to spoil the hair of the head or of the beard, not to change the fashion of man against Nature, i. e. to order the hair so as to take away in part the Natural Difference between the Sexes. This is that which an Antient *Father* on the like occasion saith, [g] To violate

[f] Χρὴ δὲ οὐδὲ γενείου τρίχα διαφθείρειν, μηδὲ τὴν μορφὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παρὰ φύσιν ἐξαλλάττειν. *Lib.* 1. *cap.* 3.

[g] Τὸ τῆς ἀνδρεοδοὺς φύσεως σύμβολον παραγνωμεῖν ἀνόσιον. *Clem. Alexand. Pædagog. l.* 2.

violate the ſymbol (or ſign) of the Virile Nature is impious. The *Wearing of hair* is ſuch a Symbol, and therefore to confound this in the Sexes, that is, for a Man to wear his hair after the Womaniſh way, and for the Woman to wear hers after the way which is proper to Men, is Unchriſtian, Impious, and Unnatural. This, in conjunction with what I have ſaid before, I take to be the Apoſtle's meaning in theſe words, *Doth not even Nature it ſelf* (and with it *Cuſtom*) *teach you, that if a man hath Long hair*, and *diſpoſes of it in that manner which women do, it is a ſhame, it is a diſhonour to him? But if a woman have Long hair, and wears it after that way of Dreſs which is proper to her Sex, the law of Nature, together with the Uſage of the ſober part of the world teacheth that it is a glory to her.* This I offer as the Full and Complete ſenſe of the Apoſtle in this Text.

And now though I have finiſhed my task, yet becauſe This place of Scripture about *men and womens Hair* comes in here only by the by, and is not the Main thing intended by the Apoſtle, but is brought to prove what he had urged before, that *women praying or propheſying ſhould cover their heads, and men uncover*

theirs,

theirs, it being (I say) brought in here as an Argument to prove the Decency of such a practice in time of Divine Worship, which is the Main and Principal thing the Apostle urgeth in the beginning of this Chapter, therefore I will annex here something of this subject, and shew you what hath been the Practice of the world as to this, and How, and for what Reasons the Apostle presseth it here. And though my chief design is to speak of this custom of *Covering* or *Uncovering the head* as it was used in *Divine Worship*, yet, to shew the utmost extent of this practice, I shall say something as I go along concerning this usage in *General* and *Civil Conversation*. I will begin first with the practice of the *Jews* and other *Eastern* people. As for the Common and Civil usage among them they seldom were Bare-headed in publick. And the mode used in Civil conversation gave the rule also for Religious Worship. The *Jews* went always with their heads covered, and so continued even at Divine Worship: and most of the *Eastern* people did the like. The *Jews* of old, both Priests that sacrificed, and People that were present, had their heads covered. Not only women but men hid their heads

and

and faces with a Veil when they prayed, as the Learned Dr *Lightfoot* hath proved. The Hebrew Doctors who tell us that they came in this posture into the Temple, and there remain'd so all the time of the Service, tell us also, that they did it out of pure Reverence, and for Fear of seeing the Divine Majesty, as they speak. And from the *Temple* this was derived to the *Synagogues*, and with some addition, for in these places you may at this day see them (not only those that Officiate, but the whole Congregation) pray standing with the Ordinary Covering on their heads, and over that likewise they cast a *Veil*. This people heretofore, when they solemnly *Mourned* (which was a piece of Religion,) veiled their heads, besides that they covered them with Dust and Ashes. Of this *Mourning Covering*, which was added to their Ordinary one, the Scripture often speaks, as in the 2 *Sam.* 15. 30. *Jer.* 14. 4. *Ezek.* 24. 27. and sundry other places. This was also used by Other Nations in the *East*, as the *Persians*; Thus *Haman mourned, having his head covered*, Esther 6. 12. And this was a Prologue to another and Worse Covering, 7 ch. 8. v. *they covered Ha-*

[b] Harmony of the N. Test. 1 *Corinth.* 11.

mans

mans face, which was done immediately upon the Kings being displeased with him, for Covering the face or head was a sign among them of being cast out of favour. This afterwards was in use among the *Jews*, and was a token of *Condemnation*: and accordingly you read that when *Christ* was *condemned to be guilty of death*, *some began to cover his face*, Mark 14. 64, 65. But passing this by, I am concerned at present in the more *usual and Ordinary Covering* which the *Jews* used. Their Priests had a Particular Covering for their heads, which is called *Migbanoth*, *Ex.* 29. 9. *Lev.* 8. 13. *Exod.* 28. 40. and sometimes, *Zaniph*, Zech. 3. 5. which are rendred by the *Seventy* κιδάρεις, and by Our Translators *bonnets* and *mitres*. After several disputes about the nature of this Covering, it is not to be doubted that it was a kind of *Turbant*, which I gather from *Ex.* 39. 28. where 'tis expressly said that it was made of *fine linnen*, and from *Ex.* 29. 9. & *Lev.* 8. 13. where 'tis said it was *bound upon* their heads. Besides, the verb *Zanaph*, *circumvolvere*, *circumligare*, whence *Zaniph* comes, shews that this was a Covering that was rolled and tied about the head. And as for the

rest

reſt of the people, they continually wore ſomething on their heads, a ſort of *Bonnet*, or *Hood*, or *Cap*, (for it is differently repreſented.) Or you may call it a *Hat*; and ſuch perhaps were thoſe *Hats* which the three young men were bound in when they were thrown into the burning fiery furnace, *Dan.* 3. 21. So our Tranſlators render the word there, though the invention of *Hats* (ſuch as we have at this day) was ſince the beginning of Queen *Elizabeths* reign. It is moſt probable that this was a ſort of *Turbants*, and that the *Jews* generally wore this ſort of Covering on their heads, though it was not ſo rich and coſtly as that which the *Prieſts* and *Great Men* wore. Whatſoever this Covering was, it was ſo cloſe to their heads that it could not be preſently pull'd off with eaſe, and ſo it was not a cuſtom to ſhew Reſpect to their Superiours or equals when they met them by pulling off this attire. For this cauſe it was no ſign of Reverence either in their Synagogues or any where elſe to be Bare-headed. They had another way of ſhewing Reverence and Reſpect to God and men, *viz.* by Bowing; which prevailed with all other Oriental people generally.

They ſhew'd alſo their Reſpect and Obeiſance by baring their feet. Hence *Moſes put off his ſhoes*: inſtead of *Uncovering his head*, he did ſo to his *feet*. And perhaps *Solomon* alludes to this Eaſtern mode in *Eccl.* 5. 1. *Keep thy foot when thou goeſt to the houſe of God*, i. e. ſhew all ſigns of *Reverence* in that place. The *Perſians* likewiſe were of the number of thoſe who uſed not to uncover their heads either in Civil or Religious converſation. And the *Mahometans* to this day (for I may bring them in here becauſe they are ſucceſſors of the Antient Eaſtern people in thoſe Countries,) theſe (I ſay,) as well as the *Perſians*, wearing *Turbants* (which are not ſo eaſily put off) have their heads conſtantly covered with them: they never put them off to the Greateſt Men or Princes. And being not uncover'd to Men, they will not be ſo to God. They perform their Religious Worſhip with their Turbants on their heads: only we are told that when they go to Prayers they touch them with the tops of their fingers, in token, ſome think, of taking them off. So much of the practice of the *Jews* and *other Eaſtern Nations*.

Let

Let us see what the *Greeks* and *Romans* did. The *Old Greeks* had a contrary practice, they used no Covering on their heads, being an Hale and Sturdy people, and not willing to use themselves tenderly. Besides, they were inured to sharp enterprizes and services in the Wars, wherein they found it most proper to come on γυμνῇ κεφαλῇ, which hath been since used in a *Proverbial* way for Bold and Manly Adventures. But those that came after them were not so disposed; for *Thucydides*, *Strabo*, and *Pollux* acquaint us that the *Spartans* wore *woollen caps* or *hats*, and that the *Helots* their servants had *dog-skin hats*: nor was it a frequent custom to vail these hats or bonnets in way of Salutation. And if you ask what was the usage at their *Worship*, *Macrobius* and *Plutarch*, two sufficient witnesses, assure you they Uncovered their heads in Divine Offices. It was their opinion it seems that the Gods were not to be addressed after the manner of Men: and therefore though many of them in ordinary and common converse covered their heads, yet they appear'd in another posture at their publick Devotions. Besides, the Temples or Places consecrated to the Gods were

heretofore Open without any roof or covering: which the Old hardy *Greeks* seemed to emulate, and would needs worship with bare heads. But the practice of the *Romans*, as it is best known, so it is most observable. It is certain that the *Old Romans* used no Covering on their heads. Whilest they were Hard and Strong, and before they were grown Effeminate it was usual with them to go Bare. Clothing arrived to what it was afterwards by degrees both for the head and other parts. But at first when they were not so tender and delicate, their very Kings and Princes, and after that, their Consuls and Greatest Officers used to go bare-headed. Yea, [1] *Julius Cæsar* reckon'd it the Greatest favour and honour that could be done him by the people, that they bestow'd upon him a Lawrel-Crown to hide his bald head. But though it was the usual Custom of the *Romans* to go with their heads Uncovered, yet this practice of theirs had these following Exceptions, (as you may gather from those who have writ of the *Roman Customs*, and particularly from *Plutarch* in his *Quæst. Roman. & Lipsius de Amphitheatro*, Cap. 19. as also from *Varro*, *Tully*, *Martial*, *Plautus*, *Sueto-*

[1] *Sueton. in* Jul. Cæs.

Suetonius, *Ovid*, *Horace*, *Saluſt*, *Seneca*, with whoſe *Names only* I trouble the Reader here, that I may ſave him the trouble afterwards of conſulting their *words* at length in the margin.) 1. At their *Plays* they were Covered. Thoſe Sports being indulged them out of Good Will and Favour, they took the liberty at that time to ſit with their caps or hats on. 2. When they *Travelled* their heads were covered againſt the injury of the weather. Although generally when hey went abroad they were bare-headed; yet in conſiderable Journeys, when they were to be a good while out, and eſpecially in Voyages at ſea, they took their caps with them. 3. In the *Wars* they moſt frequently wore theſe caps or hats. It is true *Statues* and *Medalls* preſent their Commanders and Souldiers bare-headed: but ſo they do our Kings of *England*, and generally all others. We muſt not therefore infer thence that Theſe never wear hats or any other Covering on their heads. 4. The *Aged people* wore ſomething on their heads when their hair was fallen of. 5. So did they that were *Sick*, and very much indiſpoſed by infirmity of body. 6. Some add, that when the Weather required it, as

in Rain, Snow, Hail, great Winds, or when the Sun beat on them extraordinarily, they took part of their Gown, and clapt it on their heads: but that was no formal Covering. So 7ly, when they *Mourned*, they covered their heads. 8ly, It is well known that the *Romans* when they were *made Free*, had a Hat or Cap put on their heads: for this was a Symbol or Emblem of Liberty among them. But though this Cap was given to them that were Manumitted, yet I do not read that they made any use of it; some of them never wore it afterwards. Lastly, The *Romans* (as it is obvious to observe of them; in which likewise they followed the *Grecians*) used one sort of Custom in their *Civil*, another in their *Sacred* affairs, and accordingly when they were interessed and employ'd about Religious Worship, they were not Bareheaded but Covered. And yet though they generally worshipp'd their Gods with Veild heads, I know not how it came to pass, but so it was, they worshipp'd *Saturn* with heads Uncovered. But excepting this one Instance, it is universally agreed that the *Romans*, when they were at Religious Exercises, were Covered, both Priests and People, the for-

former with their bonnets, caps or hats, the latter with some part of their clothes thrown over their heads. This is observed of them by *Plutarch* (who at the same time takes notice of the Contrary practice of the *Greeks*,) and he gives This Reason why they covered their heads when they Worship'd the Gods, *viz.* [k] because by so doing they gave a testimony of their Humility and Submission to the Gods. So *Servius* infers from a place in *Virgils* third *Æneid*, that the *Italians* covered their heads in time of Worship, of Sacrificing especially. Nothing is more acknowledg'd by the Learned then that the *Romans* cover'd their heads in their Temples, and at their Religious Service, as the *Jews* did; whom they imitated also in Veiling themselves in time of *Mourning*. And from the custom of having their heads covered when they *Worship'd* and when they *Mourned*, we may infer that they used the Contrary practice at other times, and consequently that they went with Bare-heads. Here I might remark that (contrary to the custom of the *Jews* and all *Eastern* people) Uncovering the head to Magistrates and Superiors as they passed by was used by

[k] Τοὺς δὲ θεοὺς οὕτω προσεκύνουν, ταπεινοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἐπικρύψει τῆς κεφαλῆς. *Quæst. Rom.*

the *Antient Romans* as a token of Reſpect and Honour. This was an uſage for a time, as *Varro* and *Plutarch* teſtifie: but afterwards, and in our *Apoſtle's* time tis moſt likely, that cuſtom was laid aſide, and it was not a ſign of Reverence, but of Manhood and Superiority to bare the head. The Better ſort of them, the Richeſt and moſt Creditable perſons appear'd in this poſture. Though after this *Another Cuſtom* prevail'd, and in a ſhort time *Uncovering the head* became a ſign of Reſpect and Reverence among the *Romans*, and all Weſtern and Northern people. To paſs then to the cuſtoms of *Other Nations*; the *Old Germans* and *Gauls* uſed no Covering on their heads, and therefore you cannot expect any ſuch thing in their Worſhip. As to the *Americans* lately diſcovered, the Hiſtory of thoſe places tells us that generally they being ſtrong and luſty uſe not themſelves to any Covering on their heads, as they have but little, and ſometimes none on their bodies. Particularly *Purchas* ſaith of the people of *Braſil* that they all goe Bareheaded, and their heads are as hard as blocks. This being their cuſtom, no wonder that theſe Blockheads are Uncovered

covered likewise before their Gods or Idols.

This is a short Account of the usage of *Covering the head*, especially in time of Worshipping. Now, to bring it to our purpose, and to apply it to what the Apostle enjoyns in this Chapter, and which he gives us to understand was the practice of the *Corinthian* Christians, although some had swerved from it, which occasioned his Reproof here. It is evident that S. *Paul* did not borrow this custom, of the mens *praying with the head uncovered*, from the *Jews* or *Romans*, for we have proved that in their Temples they covered their heads. Whence then was this custom among the Orderly *Christians of Corinth*, and how came the Apostle to urge it as a Decent and Reverent Observance? I answer, S. *Paul* writing to the *Grecians* (for so the *Corinthians* were) follow'd the *Grecian* custom, among whom it was usual to be Bare-headed at Divine Worship. And though the *Romans* were Covered at the service of their Gods, yet at other times they generally were Uncovered. To go with the head bare was so far from being a badg of Inferiority and Subjection, that it was rather a token of Honour

nour and Superiority, and was accordingly used by persons of the greatest Quality among them. And we are sure that *Covering the head* in some cases was a sign of Submission and Shame; and what was worse: else *caput abrubito* had not been part of the common Form of Sentencing and Condemning malefactors among them. Here then the Apostle, who used Great *Prudence*, nay *Craft*, as he himself is pleased to say, thought fit to make use both of the *Grecian* and *Roman* customs, *viz.* the practice of the former in their Religious Worship, which was the *mens Uncovering their heads*, and the usage of the latter in their Ordinary and Common converse, which was the same, and might now not seem unacceptable to the *Corinthians*, since the *Roman Tongue* and most of the *fashions* of that people were grown common among the *Greeks*, as interchangeably the *Greek Tongue* and many of their *customs* were in good repute among the *Romans*. St *Paul* therefore is pleased to introduce and adopt this custom into the *Christian Church*, and to enjoyn the Converts and Believers of *Corinth* to make use of this in their Divine Worship and Service of God. It is not to be doubted that this

1 2 *Cor.* 12. 16.

practice

practice which the Apostle here urgeth is founded even on a Civil Custom which obtain'd at that time among the persons the Apostle writ to. For the Ecclesiastical Order and Εὐταξία may be accommodated and conformed to the Civil Usages of a Place, if they have nothing of evil in them. Particularly in Prayer and Divine Service this may be observed. The Civil posture used in supplicating Kings and Great ones is lawfully used in Religious supplication of God. By the same Gesture and Habit wherewith we testifie our Respect to Men we may express our Reverence to God. All the Christians of *Europe* generally do so. Which by the by gives us the true Account why the Rites and Observances of several Churches vary from one another. The reason is because *Civil Customs* vary in several Countries: accordingly *Ecclesiastical Rites* do so too. But observe here that the Apostle who takes this Particular Custom used in Common and Civil conversation, and transfers it to a Religious use, yet would not let the other Custom, *viz.* of *Covering the head*, which so generally prevail'd in the *Roman* and *Jewish Worship* be made use of in the *Chri-*

Christian one. For it is reasonable to think that the Apostle here rebukes the Custom of the *Corinthians* about *the Men being Covered*, because it was borrowed from the *Roman Idolaters* and from the *Jews*. The *Corinthian* Church used the like in their Solemn Assemblies, and therefore they are justly reprehended because they conformed to a Custom which was so General and Prevalent among those Superstitious Worshippers, who were then Cover'd and Veild at their devotions. First, He would not have them cloud their heads at their Service as the *Gentiles* did at the worship of their Idols. It hath been intimated before that the Servile Fear of their Gods made those worshippers Veil and hide their heads: but the *Apostle* would have the Worship of *Christians* to be Free and Ingenuous, and void of that slavish Fear and Dread. Besides, this would be an imitating of the *Jews*, who without any Prescription and Order from God wrapt up their heads in Veils when they were at their Publick Worship. The Apostle would by no means allow the *Christians* to follow this practice of Praying with their faces covered, it being so great a piece of Jewish Superstition. He would

would not ſuffer them to ape the *Jewiſh* people in this kind of Hood-wink'd Devotion. For Theſe Reaſons and for *Others* ſuggeſted in this Chapter, St *Paul*'s will is that the *Corinthian Men*, who were Converts and Saints, ſhould be *Bare-headed* in their Religious Aſſemblies. And from St *Paul* all Chriſtians generally have received and practiſed this Uſage, though not upon the very ſame grounds and reaſons for which he urged this practice. For the Chriſtian Churches at this day conform to this uſage, becauſe among them generally the Token of Reſpect or Reverence to Men is Uncovering the head, and therefore they obſerve This alſo in their Addreſſes to God, and expreſs their Adoration and Worſhip by having no Covering on their heads. And herein they follow the Apoſtle himſelf, who (as I have ſuggeſted) made choice of the Civil uſage of the *Grecians* and *Romans*, and brought it into the Church.

Hitherto I have ſpoken only of *the Covering* or *Uncovering uſed by Men*. In the next place, becauſe the Apoſtle adds, *Every woman that prayeth or Propheſieth with her head uncovered diſhonours her head*, I muſt adjoyn a few words concer-

concerning the Injunction which is included in these words, *viz.* that the *Christian Women* were to cover and veil their heads when ever they were emploi'd in Religious Worship. The Covering or Veiling the head among that Sex is no New thing. It was an antient custom to bring the wife to the husband covered with a *Veil*, as we expressly read of *Rebekah*, when she was brought to *Isaac*, Gen. 24. 65. and thence likely it was that *Jacob* was beguiled by *Laban*, and thought he had *Rachel* when he was in possession of *Leah*. The *Rabins* tell us that he that joyned the man and woman in marriage used to *Cover the head* of the bride with the end of the linnen which hung down from the bridegrooms neck. To which they say *Ruth* refer'd when she spoke to *Boaz* to *spread his Skirt* (the end of his garment) *over her*, Ruth 3. 9. And hence *Marriage* it self is call'd *Chuppah*, from *Chippah*, to cover. The *Jewish* women generally after they were married used a *Veil*; they went covered with this into the Temple and Synagogues, and they wore it wherever they appear'd publickly. As for the women among the *Romans*, it is well known that *Nubere*, which

which is the proper word for their *Marrying*, is as much as *Obnubere*, because she *clouded* or *covered* her head: for those that are acquainted with the *Roman* Customs know that the Bride was brought home covered with a Veil. To this our *English* or rather *Norman* Laws may allude perhaps, which call a Married Woman a *femme covert*, and by it they understand the Womans being *Sub potestate viri* (as they speak,) under the power of her husband. A woman, when she marries, puts her self into a state of *Subjection*, and this without doubt was signified heretofore by the *Veiling* her. Thus it was among the *Jews* and *Romans*, and thus it was among the *Grecians* (who imitated the *Romans*, as I said before, in many things,) at least it was thus among the *Corinthians* whom the Apostle wrote to; the Women went *Veiled* to shew their Humility and Subjection. And indeed this custom remains still not only among the *Turks* but most *Eastern* Countries, yea in most parts of the world. This Canon then of the Apostle (as the other concerning Mens Uncovering their heads) is taken from the Civil usage among Women at that time, (not excluding

bus

cluding the Other Reasons assigned by the Apostle in this Chapter on which he grounds this practice.) All modest and honest Matrons, Wives, and even Virgins wore certain *Veils* or *Coverings on their heads*, and they never used to appear publickly without them. And the Apostle liked this Custom so well that he would have it obtain in the *Worship of God*. The Modesty which women shew at Other times must much more be expressed in the Sacred Assemblies. If they go with Veiled heads in all other places, certainly it is unbecoming to come Unveil'd and Uncover'd into the Publick Congregation. Hence he enjoyns that a *Woman praying or Prophesying be Covered*. This *Prophesying* of Women was foretold by the Prophet *Joel*, 2. ch. 28. v. and we read some Instances of it in *Acts* 21. 9. Some of these *Prophesying Women* were in the Church of *Corinth*, and being extraordinarily Gifted (which was the peculiar Donation of those first times of the Gospel) they *Pray'd* and *Preach'd* publickly (which latter especially was a Manly Office,) and they proceeded to usurp on the Custom which was proper to the *Men*, i. e. they *Uncovered their heads*,

and

and would needs have their Faces seen as well as their Voices heard. The Apostle soon took notice of this bold disorder, and here enjoyns them (together with all other women) a modest *Veil*, or rather he doth but bid them practice the known Custom used by that Sex. This Injunction without doubt was observ'd by all the Faithfull women; and we may inform our selves from Ecclesiastical History that it was derived to After ages, and practised a long time by that Sex. It came down as far as the Emperour *Decius*'s time, by the same token that he put out a Decree that the Christian women at *Rome* should leave off wearing the *Veil* on their heads, hoping that by that Immodest usage they might be brought at last to Paganism and Idolatry. But his design did not take of perverting their minds and bringing them to comply with the Pagan Worship, though they laid aside their *Veils* and went Bare-headed, for which they gave This Reason, [m] that they counted it an Honour to them to suffer this disgrace among men for Christs sake. But soon after (if not about the same time) the *Veil* was thrown off, not by force of Persecutors but of Choise

[m] Δόξαν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ δοκεῖν αἰσχύνην παρὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. *Cedren. Hist. Compend.*

for which that Sex is ſmartly reprehended by *Tertullian*, in his piece *de Velandis Virginibus*: where his main indeavour is to prove that Virgins as well as Married Women were to be Veild in the Religious Aſſemblies, and that it was S. *Paul*'s meaning in this Chapter. Wherefore he reproves the manners of the Women and Maids who came into the Congregations Uncovered and in their Hair, as a direct breach of the Apoſtolical Canon. And certainly ſo it was, for that which the Apoſtle delivers in this Chapter concerning Womens behaviour in the Churches did not only oblige the Women of that time, but is obligatory to this very day. All Chriſtian women are ingaged by vertue of what the Apoſtle here ſaith, to be always with their heads covered in time of Prayer and other Religious Exercises. The Women among the *Jews* and the *Turks* meet apart from the Men when they pray in publick: the Women (according to their cuſtom) are ſhut up by themſelves. But this is a kind of Excommunicating them, and therefore is not allowable: wherefore let the Apoſtles Injunction take place, that is, let them not appear with their heads Unco-

Uncovered all the time they are at Divine Worship. At other times and in other places, especially at home and in their own families, *Christian women*, and more especially *English women*, may lawfully shew themselves without a Covering on their heads (unless it be that which the Apostle saith was *given them for a Covering*,) that it may appear they are not of the number of those women who are servilely used, as it is the custom of some Countries, where no woman is seen but with her head muffled up and quite hid.

But it will be said, The Argument of the Apostle will not hold now, *Covering the head* being not a sign of *Subjection*, but of the contrary among us. I answer, Christian women may, in conformity to the antient practice of their Sex, observe the Apostles Injunction though not for that one Particular Reason which he mentions, *viz.* to testifie Subjection to their husbands. Suppose that be Obsolete, and Antiquated with us, yet there are Other Reasons, which will always hold, *viz.* the regard which they ever ought to have to their Chastity, the due care which they ought to take lest they expose themselves by

an unseemly behaviour, the extraordinary Modesty as well as Reverence which they are obliged to express whiles they are concern'd in the Worship of God, the deep sense of their being observ'd not only by Men, but by God and Angels. Which last consideration seems to be made use of by our Apostle when he saith, *For this cause the woman ought to have power on her head because of the Angels*, v. 10. She ought to have *power*. What is that? The same Hebrew word (as our Learned *Annotator* observes) which signifies a *Veil*, denotes also ἐξουσιαν *power*; when 'tis said therefore that the woman ought to have power on her head, here is meant a *Veil on her head*, which is a sign and token of the *power* over her. This all women ought to wear in the Congregation, if not in subjection to *Man* yet in reverence to *Angels*, those Heavenly and Divine Spirits who are present in the Publick Assemblies (as even the Heathen Moralists have confessed,) and are Overseers and Witnesses of the behaviour of Women as well as of Men in the Church. I know there are Other Glosses on these words; some with *Beza* understand by the *Angels* the Ministers and Governours of the Church, the

רְדִיד *velum, à Radad dominari, potestatem in aliquem exercere.* So I could observe that the word *Sakak* is used for *potestas* and *tegumentum.*

the Prophets that Propheſied in the Congregation, and they think that St *Paul* exhorts the Women to be veiled, that they might not by expoſing their beauty be an occaſion of diverting thoſe perſons from their ſerious employment. Our Great Engliſh Rabbi fancies that by the *Angels* are meant the Meſſengers or Deputies of Eſpouſals, and that women had the liberty of unveiling or veiling their faces upon their account. But that which may confute this opinion is this (not to ſpeak of the unuſual acception of the word *Angels*) that the Apoſtle in this Chapter ſpeaks of the Sex in general, but eſpecially of Married Women, whereas this Author reſtrains the Apoſtles words to the Unmarried only. This Worthy Man hath another interpretation, of a far different nature, which is this, that *Evil Angels* or *Devils* are to be underſtood here, and that the Apoſtle's meaning is (to deliver it in this Authors own words) that °*women muſt not expoſe their faces in the publick congregation leſt the Devil make a bait of their beauty, and thereby intangle the hearts and eyes of the men.* Laſtly, I could offer a conjecture of my own, *viz.* that διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους is a miſtake of the

° Harmony of the N. Teſt.

Transcribers for διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους, *because of the flocks*, i. e. the Congregations or Assemblies of Christians, which are called *flocks*, *Mat.* 26. 31. *Acts* 20. 28. 1 *Pet.* 5. 2, 3. (although the same Greek word be not used in these places.) The plain sense then is that Women ought not to appear with uncovered heads, but to behave themselves with singular modesty and humility, considering the Solemn Employment which they are about. They are met together to worship God, they are come into the Assemblies of the Faithfull for no other end, therefore let them not dare to shew themselves Immodest and Irreverent, let them have a Veil on their heads *because of the flock of Christ*: let them avoid all lightness and vanity, and set themselves with the utmost seriousness to that Divine Work which they are gathered together for, and let them in this be *ensamples to the flock*. But if you will not admit of any alteration in the *Greek Copy*, (which I am not very forward to urge) then in my judgement the first Interpretation which I named seems to be the most genuine. When the Apostle enjoyns the women to cover their heads *because of the Angels*, he proceeds upon

upon the received opinion of the Jews, that Angels are always present in Religious Meetings, and indeed in all Great and Weighty Consultations. Wherefore he suggests the Reasonableness of womens modest behaviour in the Congregation because of these Angels. As if the Apostle had said, If Men be disregarded by you, yet have respect to these Invisible Overseers and Observers, who take notice of your loose and disorderly carriage, and will one day represent it to your disadvantage. This Reason is perpetual.

And thus I have finished the Consideration of these words. The summ is this, That the Apostle is desirous those Christians at *Corinth*, who had been converted by his Ministry, should *walk orderly*, and *as became* the professors of the Gospel. Wherefore he blames the Men for Covering their heads, and the Women for laying aside their Veils in time of Religious Worship; and again he chides both Sexes for another Disorder, *viz.* that the Men wore their Hair like Women, and that These appeared in the guise of Men as to their Hair. He lets them know that both these kinds of Disorders are re-

pugnant to the Inſtitution of God and the Dictates of Reaſon. But eſpecially the latter of theſe practiſes is confuted here by an *Appeal to Nature*, which is a *Comprehenſive Topick*, and you may underſtand by it the General dictate of Natural Reaſon, and the Particular Law of Nature concerning Diſtinction of Sexes, as alſo Uſage and Cuſtom which is a Second Nature. According to the direction of theſe the Apoſtle would have them walk, ſuggeſting that not only the *Length* but the *Adorning of the hair* are Uncomely and Indecorous, and therefore Unnatural in the Manly Sex, but are Comely and Decent, yea even Proper and Natural in the other. In a word, a Man muſt not be like a Woman either as to her *Veil* and *Covering* or as to her *Long* and *Dreſſed Hair*, becauſe he is taught otherwiſe by the Law of *Reaſon*, and by that of the *Sex*, and even by the *Practice and Cuſtom* of the ſobereſt part of the world, which are all compriſed in the large extent of the word *Nature* in this place of the Apoſtle.

The

The third TEXT Enquired into, viz.

1 Corinth. XV. 29.

Else what shall they do, that are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they also baptized for the dead?

Or thus,

Moreover, what shall they do that are baptized for the sake of the dead, if the dead are not raised at all? why are they even (or therefore) baptized for the sake of the dead?

IF I should say of these words as S. *Austin* saith of Those in 1 *Cor.* 3. 15. [*He shall be saved yet so as by fire,*] namely that it is one of those places in S. *Pauls* Epistles which S. *Peter* tells us are [a] *hard to be understood*; I believe it would be difficult for any one to disprove my assertion. For even what the Apostle there

[a] 2 *Pet.* 3. 16.

there adds is applicable to These words also, *They that are unstable and unlearned wrest them unto their own destruction*: which plainly appears in the application of This Text to the doctrine of *Purgatory* by some of the Roman Church. But whether St *Peter* had an eye to This particular passage of our Apostle or no, I profess to know not. Yet sure I am it may justly be ranked among his *δυσνοητα*, since it hath not been found any easie task to reach the right understanding and sense of it. It is generally acknowledged that This Text is not of the Ordinary rank, but that it contains in it an Unusual and Surprizing manner of expression. Interpreters have shrewdly Tugged, and those who have been observed to be Lazy enough sometimes have here plentifully Sweated, that they might have the Credit of giving us the Apostle's true meaning, that by any means they might *attain to the Resurrection, and Baptism of the dead* in this Chapter. Give me leave to present you with a Brief Account of their several Indeavours and Different Decisions in the case, with a free and Impartial Animadversion on them, and then to take the boldness to offer my Own thoughts in the Controversie,

verſie, which I purpoſe to do (as I ought) with a ſtrict Veneration of Antiquity and the Primitive Writers of the Church, with a faithful regard to the Maſters of Grammer and Criticiſm, with a due reſpect to the Whole Context, and to the Analogy of Chriſtian faith. I think it will not be amiſs in the firſt place to rank the Expoſitors on This place after This Method. They underſtand it of *Baptiſm* either *Properly* or *Improperly* taken: 1. *Properly*, for a Real and Outward Waſhing with water. 2. *Improperly* or Metaphorically, for the Baptiſm of Affliction and Suffering, as ſometimes the word is underſtood. But the *Proper Baptizing* or Waſhing will ingage me moſt of all in This Diſcourſe, and That is threefold, 1. *Sacramental*, which is no other then that Holy Ordinance of Chriſts inſtitution, whereby children or thoſe of riper years are admitted into the Chriſtian Church by the action of outward Waſhing or Sprinkling with water. 2. *Funeral Waſhing*, which was practiſed in order to the burying of the dead bodies. 3. *Legal or Ceremonial waſhing*, uſed by the *Jews* as often as they were defiled by touching the dead: and this was done either in their own perſons, or by another

ther for them in case they died before they were Cleansed.

I. Begin we with the Various Interpretations of Those on the place who understand it of *Sacramental Baptizing*. And first, there are some who interpret it of Those who *at their Baptism* profess themselves *dead to sin and to the world*: and by this Baptismal act they are reputed to be thus *Spiritually dead*. A second Opinion is of those who imagine the words spoken of *Baptism* as *it representeth the Bodily Death*. Others understand it of *Baptism* as it was accompanied with the confession of the Article of the *Resurrection of the dead*. A fourth sort say it is spoken of the *Clinicks*, those who lay on their sick beds, and receive the Sacrament of *Baptism*. Fifthly, others understand it of *Baptizing over the dead*, over the Tombs of the Deceased Martyrs. Sixthly, there are some who think it is meant of *Baptizing in the place and stead of the dead*. Seventhly, there is a Learned man who thinks it is spoken of an *Annual Baptizing for the benefit of the dead*. Eightly, Another conceiveth it refers to *Baptizing with the imposition of the names of the dead*. Lastly, there is a Learned Critick

Critick who diſſents from all the forenamed Opinions, and is perſwaded that ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν is put here for ὑπὲρ τῦ νεκρῦ, the Plural for the Singular: but how he applies it you ſhall hear afterwards.

1. I begin with the Firſt, the Opinion of thoſe who imagine Theſe words are ſpoken of *Baptized Chriſtians*, who by this very Sacrament profeſſed to the world that they were *Spiritually dead*. So that *to be baptized for the dead* is as much as *to be reputed as dead perſons when they were baptized*, or, *at their baptiſm to be like dead men*, viz. Dead in reſpect of Sin and any Love to it. At that Solemn Initiating themſelves into the Church they openly renounced their former ſins, they publickly diſowned their paſt vices, they became Mortified perſons, and betook themſelves to a Severe and Strict courſe of life: thus (Myſtically and Spiritually ſpeaking) they were *Dead*. So the words are interpreted by ſome [b] Antient Fathers: with whom agree a few of the Moderns, amongſt whom a [d] late Writer expreſſes his ſenſe thus, "Baptized for the dead "are they who when they are baptized "declare that they are ready to Die to "the

[b] *St Jerom, Chryſoſtom, Theodoret, Primaſius, Sedulius.*

[c] *Melancton, Cajetan, &c.*

[d] *Philip. à Limborch Theolog. Chriſtian. l. 6. c. 10.*

"the world, to be in it as Dead men, "and to live a new life: and if occa- "sion be, to submit to the Croſs, and "Die for their Religion. This they do "that they may have a bleſſed Reſur- "rection. But This Interpretation will be far from gaining our conſent if we con- ſider (beſides what I ſhall add under the next Opinion) but theſe two things: First, there is no reaſon to interpret theſe *baptized for the dead*, of thoſe that are *ſpiritually dead*, becauſe it is generally ad- viſed by all Sober Interpreters of Scrip- ture, that we ſhould not flie to an Im- proper and Metaphorical ſenſe when the Literal and Proper one will ſerve our turn. But I ſhall afterwards prove that a Plain and Literal meaning of theſe words is moſt probable and reaſonable. Secondly, the Context it ſelf will confute this in- terpretation, for if the Spiritual Death be here meant, i. e. *the being buried with Chriſt in baptiſm*, and being dead to ſin and the world, then who will think there is any *Conſequence* in the Apoſtles Rea- ſoning, whilſt he argueth from a Spi- rituall and Myſtical Death and Reſur- rection (of which *Baptiſm* is a Sign) unto that which is Bodily and External, which is the ſubject he here treats of through

through out the whole Chapter. The Inference is so Forcing that I cannot see how it will ever be admitted.

2. Others are of the opinion, that These words are spoken of *Baptism as it represents the Bodily Death.* And some of the Fathers who were Patrons of the First Interpretation, were pleased also to espouse this Second: for they thought fit to joyn both these together, viz. the Spiritual and the Bodily Death, asserting that the *Representation* or *Resemblance of both* was intended here by the Apostle. Now let us see how they apply these words to the Death of the Body. They hold that the Apostle's Argument in the Text is of this sort, If there shall be no *rising of the dead* hereafter, why is *Baptism* so significant a Symbol of our Dying and Rising again, and also of the Death and Resurrection of Christ? For those that were Proselytes to the Christian Religion, were interpreted to make an open profession of These in their being plunged into the Baptismal water, and in being there Overwhelmed and *buried* as it were in the Consecrated Element. The Immersion into the water was thought to signifie the Death of Christ, and their Coming out denoted his

his Rising again, and did no less represent their Own future Resurrection. On which account the Minister's putting in of the Christian Converts into the Sacred waters, and his taking them out thence, are stiled by S. *Chrysostom* [e] the Sign and Pledge of descending into the state of the dead, and of a return from thence. And thus because the Washing and Plunging of the newly admitted Christians was a Visible Proof and Emblem first of Christ's, and then of Their Resurrection from the grave, the forementioned Fathers have been induced to believe that This passage of our Apostle which I am speaking of hath a particular respect to That, and is to be Interpreted by it. Nay, this seems to agree exactly with the language and tenour of our Apostle himself, who may be thought to be the Best Interpreter of his own words. *Know ye not*, saith he, *that so many of us as were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death? therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead, even so we also should walk in newness of life*, Rom. 6. 3, 4. It is no matter of admiration to me that some have thought and confidently asser-

[e] Τῆς εἰς ᾅδου καταβάσεως καὶ τῆς ἐκεῖθεν ἀνόδου σύμβολον. *Homil. in* 1 *Epist. ad Corinth.* 15. *cap.*

ted

ted, that the Apoſtle's manner of ſpeech here is the ſame with that in the Text which is before us, and that καὶ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, is to be explained and commented upon by εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ βαπτισθήμεν, and by that other expreſſion, συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς θάνατον. They may ſeem indeed at firſt to be near a kin to one another, and to bear upon them the very ſame Stamp and Form of ſpeech. But I conceive it was only ſome little Reſemblance of the Phraſe and Stile, or Mode of ſpeech, not the ſame Significancy and Real Matter couched in both theſe places which wrought any to This Opinion. But without any more diſpute, I would admit of the Interpretation before mentioned as moſt Natural and Genuine, upon condition that any one can make it good out of but One Greek Author, much more from the Uſe and Idiom of the Tongue, that *to be baptized* ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν *for the dead*, ſignifies *to be baptized as dead*, or, *after the manner and ſimilitude of thoſe that are dead*: for Thoſe of the former Opinion and of This (that is, thoſe that interpret the words of a Repreſentation of the Spiritual or Bodily Death) acknowledge *for the dead*, is as much

much as *like the dead*, or, *in reſemblance of the dead*, or, *after the manner of the dead*. Theſe muſt be proved to be Synonymous before that Firſt or this Second Expoſition of the words can look for our Aſſent and Suffrage. Let it be proved that ὑπερ is as much as ὡς or ὡσει, i.e. that it is a word of *Similitude*, and ſignifies the ſame with *ſicut*, *tanquam*, *quaſi*, in the Latin, or the ſame with the Hebrew כ, which is uſed in Comparing and Likening one thing with another. Till then it cannot be credited, that *for the dead*, ſignifies *a Reſemblance or Likeneſs to thoſe that are dead*. I grant that *Pro* in *Latin* is ſometimes as much as *quaſi*, *perinde*, *inſtar*; as when we read in *Tully*, *pro nihilo putare vel ducere*, to eſteem as nothing: and (to come nearer to the preſent matter) when the ſame Author ſaith, *pro occiſo relictus eſt*, he was left *as* dead. So *pro mortuis* may be applied in a ſentence to ſignifie as much as *tanquam mortui*. And it is true that in our Own Vulgar way of ſpeaking, *for dead* denotes as much as *dead*, or *as dead*: thus we ſay, ſuch a one lay *for dead*, or was taken up *for dead*. But I never heard that it was thus in the Greek Tongue, and therefore I am very loth to charge

charge our Apoſtle here (as *Eraſmus* and *Calvin* do in other places) with falſe Greek. I grant that the *Actions in Baptiſm* (eſpecially as it was adminiſtred of old) were Repreſentative of the Death and Reſurrection both of Chriſt and Believers: but that St *Pauls* words here have reference to any ſuch thing, the Propriety of Phraſe (as you have heard) will not permit us to believe. Beſides, you may obſerve (as you ſhall have farther occaſion hereafter to take notice) it is ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν with a Præpoſitive Article, which utterly ſpoils that ſenſe which is pretended: for the Apoſtle ſpeaks here Definitively, and not at large: and the words are rightly rendred [*for the dead*] not [*for dead.*]

3. The next interpretation is that of St *Chryſoſtom*, (for you muſt know it is uſual with Him to adjoyn one Opinion to another, as *here* he thinks fit to add This which I am now mentioning, to thoſe other two which I nam'd before) and he is followed by *Theophylact* and *Oecumenius*, and they by *Hemmingius* and our Learned *Hammond*. The *baptized for the dead*, ſay they, were thoſe who were *baptized upon the Article of the Reſurrection of the dead*, and conſequently *in hope of that Reſurrection.*

So that the Apoſtle here is thought by them to refer to the Form of Confeſſion of Faith, or Reciting the Articles of the Creed, in which among other things the perſon to be baptized openly profeſſed his belief of That Article of the Reſurrection of the dead. And the Great Canoniſts, *Balſamon* and *Zonaras*, refer the Apoſtle's words to This Cuſtom, and explain them in Theſe terms, [f] What ſhall they do that are baptized in the *hope* of the reſurrection of the dead? Which anſwers to the expoſition of *Theophylact*, [g] What ſhall they do who are baptized on the *Expectation* of the deads riſing again? But 1. though it be univerſally acknowledged that ſoon after the Apoſtle's time, a Publick Profeſſion of the Creed was required of thoſe that preſented themſelves to be Baptized, yet it remains to be proved that in the Time wherein our Apoſtle lived they ſolemnly Recited a Form of Belief at Baptiſm, and that they had This very Confeſſion of Faith which now goes under the Apoſtles Names. This is Doubtful at leaſt, and ſo we ought not to be Definitive and Peremptory about it, and therefore we cannot be ſure that the Apoſtle argues in this place from any ſuch practice as the

[f] Τὶ ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῦ ἀναστῆναι τὺς νεκρύς; *Not. in* 18 *Can. Concil. Carthag.*

[g] Ἐπὶ προσδοκίᾳ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν. *In locum.*

the Rehearſal of the Creed. 2ly, Grant that this Form of Confeſſion was uſed at Baptiſm by the *Catechumeni*, and that all the Articles of it were openly rehearſed, and conſequently, in the Cloſe that of the Reſurrection of the dead: yet then it ſhould rather have been ſaid, *What ſhall they do that are baptized for thoſe that are Riſen from the dead*, not barely, *for the dead?* Nay 3ly, who ſees not yet farther a Greater Impropriety and Harſhneſs in the Apoſtle's way of ſpeaking, if *to be baptized for the dead* muſt be interpreted thus, *to be baptized in hope of the reſurrection of the dead?* Firſt, [*the dead*] is put here for *the dead bodies* of the deceaſed, for Theſe only can be ſaid to *riſe* at the laſt day. And therefore it is St *Chryſoſtoms* Gloſs on the words, [h] *for the dead*, that is (ſaith he) *for the dead bodies*. Secondly, [the *dead bodies*] is put for the *Reſurrection of thoſe dead bodies*. Nay, Thirdly, it is put for the *Confeſſion*, or the *Article*, or the *Faith*, or *Hope of the reſurrection of the dead bodies*. This is too Conciſe a way of ſpeaking: wherefore I yield to our Judicious *Thorndyke*, who deſcanting on this paſſage, concludes it cannot be juſtified by any Example, that ὑπερ τῶν

[h] ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, τοῦτ' ἔστι τῶν σωμάτων.

νεκρῶν should signifie ἐπὶ ἀναστάσει τῶν νεκρῶν, as St *Chryſoſt.* would have it. Nay 4^ly, if the words were to be taken in his ſenſe, the *Article* which is here inſerted, ſhould be left out, and it ſhould have been barely ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν, as the Learned *Hammond* ſets it down in his *Annotations*, being Conſcious (as it were) that it ſhould be ſo.

4. Let us paſs to another Reading of the words, and it ſhall be ſtill of Thoſe who take *Baptizing* here in the *Sacramental ſenſe*, and hold that *the baptized for the dead* were thoſe perſons who *had That Sacrament adminiſtred to them when they were cloſe upon the confines of death, and juſt expiring their laſt.* This Expoſition is abetted by *Calvin.* The *baptized for the dead*, ſaith he, are they who are baptized when they are Dying, [1] when they are given over, and look'd upon as dead. And ſo the particle ὑπὲρ is as much as the Latin *pro*, as when they ſay, *habere pro derelicto.* [k] Other Learned Writers alſo take This to be the ſenſe of the Apoſtle's words; but it came firſt from *Epiphanius*, in his Book [l] againſt *Hereticks*, who acquaints us that when it ſo chanced that the *Catachumeni* or New Comers to Chriſtianity were overtaken with ſome Mortal diſtemper, and there was

[1] *Qui jam mortui cenſeantur, & qui de vitâ omnino deſperaverint.*

[k] *Peter Martyr, Ludovicus Capellus, Eſtius*

[l] *Hæreſ.* 28.

was an utter Deſpair of their Living till they could be brought to the Sacred Font, they uſed to be baptized ἐν ταῖς κλίναις, as they lay in their Beds: and from that uſage of theirs the *Clinici* or Bed-ridden took their Name. For you muſt know that it was uſuall with thoſe that were converted to Chriſtianity to defer their Baptiſm. Perhaps (ſay ſome) at firſt it proceeded from fear and cowardize, which made them unwilling to hazard themſelves by the open profeſſion of their Religion, and ſo they put off their admiſſion into the Church as long as they could; but when they were arreſted by Grievous Sickneſs, and confined to their Beds, they paſſionately begged to be baptized before they left the world. This was one ſort of *Clinicks*. But there was a ſecond ſort who deferred their Baptiſm on other accounts: Theſe were no New Converts, but ſuch as had imbraced Chriſtianity a conſiderable time; yet they purpoſely deferred their Baptiſm on one pretended ground or other. Thus *Conſtantine the Great* was not baptized till the [m] ſixty fifth year of his age, which was the one and thirtieth year of his Empire: and he declared himſelf (as [n] *Euſebius* teſtifies) that he delay'd his

[m] Socrat. *Eccl. Hiſt. l.* 1. *c.* 26. Sozom. *l.* 2. *c.* 37.

[n] *De vit. Conſtant. l.* 4. *c.* 61.

Baptism because he intended to be Baptized in the River *Jordan*, the place which was so famous for the first Baptizing, and where our Saviour himself was baptized. But he was hindred from going thither, (though I see no Cause of that hindrance in so many years,) and being Aged he fell sick, and was Baptized in the City of *Nicomedia* (where he then was) by *Eusebius* Bishop (either at that time, or formerly) of that place, and he died in the very same year he was Baptized. I know this is Contradicted, and it is said he was not baptized in the East, but in the West, not by a Greek Bishop but a Roman one. This was *Miltiades*, say some: others stiffly maintain that it was *Sylvester*, and this they have from [o] one of the Roman Bishops, who wrote *Sylvesters* Life, and asserts that He baptized *Constantine* telling us withall that this Emperour, among other Admirable Ornaments and Utensils, kept in his Palace the Font wherein he was baptized, and describes the Make and Costlineſs of it. [p] It seems it is since translated or thought to be translated to *Rome*, and there is kept as a Choice Memorial. And as for the Occasion of *Constantine*'s being Baptized, they tell us

[o] *Damas. lib. Pontif*

[p] Dr *Burnets Travels.*

it

it was This, he being guilty of his ſon *Criſpus*'s bloud and other unnatural murders, was ſtruck by God with Leproſie, which Affected him ſo much that he applied himſelf to the Biſhop, and ſhew'd himſelf Sorrowful for the fact; and to give an evidence of his Repentance he deſired to receive Baptiſm. Then by the Biſhops Prayers and this Holy Laver he was cured of his Noiſome Diſtemper. This was in the eighteenth year of his reign, *A. D.* 324. and is mentioned by *Zoſimus* and *Baronius*. Yet *Cedrenus* and others ſay he was baptized at *Rome* by this *Sylveſter* ſome years before, *viz.* in the ſeventh year of his reign. But *Euſebius*, the famous Biſhop of *Caſarea* in *Paleſtine*, who writ the Life of *Conſtantine*, ſaith not a word of all this, but ¶ tells us that he was baptized not at *Rome*, but at *Nicomedia*, and that many years after the *Nicene Council*, in the cloſe of his life, the laſt year of his reign, (five years after *Sylveſter* was dead) by *Euſebius* Biſhop of *Nicomedia*: and this is teſtified and confirmed by St *Jerom*, St *Ambroſe*, *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, *Theodoret*, and others, and ſeems to be the True Account of the Emperours Baptiſm. To haſten then

¶ *Conſtantine*'s Life, book 4. ch. 61, 62.

out

out of this *Digression*, this Example of *Constantine*'s deferring his Baptism was follow'd by several other succeeding Emperours. Thus his son *Constantius* [f] was baptized at the point of Death: *Theodosius the Great* falling sick was thereupon baptized, and Recovered upon it: but he had deferr'd his Baptism longer [g] if his sickness had not hastned it. The next [h] *Theodosius* was not baptized till he was very old. Ecclesiastical History acquaints us also that the Emperour *Valentinian* put off his Baptism, that he might receive that Sacrament from St *Ambrose*, but he was prevented by death. We read the same of some of the most Eminent *Fathers* of the Church: St *Jerom* and St *Ambrose* were not baptized till they were thirty years of age, although their Parents were Christians. *Augustin* was a *Manichean* till he was one and thirty years old, and then (and not before) he was baptized by the foresaid St *Ambrose* the famous Bishop of *Milan*. Thus it was also in the *Greek Church*: some of the most Eminent persons (besides the Emperours before spoken of) deferr'd their Baptism till they came to some ripeness of years. Thus *Chrysostom*, though born of and bred up under

[f] Ἀποθνήσκων ἔδοξε βαπτίζεσθαι. *Athanas. de Syn. Arimini & Seleuc.*
[g] *Socrat. l. 5. c. 25.*
[h] *Oros. l. 7. c. 33.*

under a Christian Mother, and *Gregory Nazianzen* born of Christian Parents, were not baptized till they arrived to be Men. *Nectarius*, Archbishop of *Constantinople*, entered into Episcopal Orders before he was baptized. Now, there are Different, yea Contrary Reasons alledged for this practise: some did purposely put off their Baptism till death approached, that they might be the more at liberty to indulge their follies and vices: for when one of the *Catechumeni* Committed a fault, they used to excuse his failing by alledging This in his favour, that he was not yet Baptized. They did it also that they might not sin after the celebrating the Sacrament of Baptisme, for S. *Cyprian* tells us they had This fond and groundless notion, that there was no Pardon for those that relapsed into sin after Baptisme. This arose from the mistaking of That place, *Heb.* 6. 4, 5. which the *Novatians* very warmly insisted upon, and would by no means Absolve those that lapsed after Baptism. But the Orthodox Fathers were of another mind, and sharply reproved this custom of deferring Baptism. [u] *Gregory Nyssen* hath a whole Oration against it, and [x] *Gregory Nazianzen*

[u] *Orat. de baptismum differentibus.*

[x] *Orat. 40 de Baptismo.*

[1] *Hom. 1 & 23 in Act. Apost.*

[2] *Serm. 97. de Temp.*

zen and [1] *Chrysostom* inveigh against it very zealously. So St *Augustin* (whose parents delay'd his Baptism on purpose, because they fear'd the Young mans Relapse into his former vices) [2] complains of This Abuse in the Church, which prevail'd in his days. It seems it was grown into a Custom to omit the receiving of Baptism as long as they were in health (and perhaps the Example of *Constantine* and his son *Constantius* who did so gave some repute to this evil usage,) but as soon as they fell sick they bethought themselves of their duty, and when they perceived the Malady grew desperate, and themselves irrecoverable, then they sent presently for the Christian Priests, and solemnly gave up their Names to Christ in Holy Baptism, as being desirous to carry out of the world with them the Seal of their Eternal Salvation. These are call'd by the Council of *Laodicea* (which was under *Sylvester*) οἱ ἐν νόσῳ παραλαμβανοντες τὸ φώτισμα, those that were admitted to Baptism when they lay sick, for φώτισμα here signifieth *Baptism*, as it doth frequently among the Antients. This was call'd ἐνταφιον βαπτισμα by [3] *Gregory Nyssen*, because they desired to be Baptized and

[3] *Orat. de baptism. differentib.*

to

to Die at once. Of these speak [b] St *Cyprian*, [c] *Eusebius*, and many Writers of the Primitive Times, and the Canons of several Councils. Of such as These, *viz.* the *Moribundi*, who lay on their Death-Beds, and called for Speedy Baptism, some interpret the words of the Text. But that they have but little reason, I shall prove from these following Particulars. 1. It is not probable that that sort of *Clinicks* who were newly converted from Paganism is here meant, because in those *first days* Fear and Faintheartedness did not possess men, as they are known to have done afterwards. A singular Zeal and Ardency inspired their minds, and they were not ashamed to own and publickly maintain the Faith they had espoused: yea, they gloried in their sufferings for the Cause of Christ, and rejoyced in their persecutions for it, as the *Acts of the Apostles* assure us. It is not likely therefore that These deferr'd their being baptized on the forenamed account, and consequently it is not likely that the Text speaks of these. 2. It is not certain that it was the opinion of the Christians in the *Apostles* days, that Sin after Baptism is Irremissible, which was another ground of the Custom

[b] *Epist. 7 ad Magnum.*
[c] *Eccl. Hist. l. 6. c. 43.*

Custom of deferring Baptism. And consequently it is to be said, and that with evident Truth, that it doth not appear in the least that the forementiond Custom of the believers requesting baptism in the very close of their lives prevail'd in the times of the *Apostles*: but it seems rather to have crept in after those first Guides of the Church were gone; and therefore that Glosse on the words can have but a slender foundation. Or 3^ly, say that such an Use obtained even in the Apostles days, yet will not St *Pauls* Argument have any force at all by relating unto That. For thus it must proceed, What shall the baptized *Clinicks* do if the dead rise not at all? why are they also baptized just at the point of death? why have they that Holy Sacrament given to them at the last gasp? if there be no Rising again, why do they thus? It may be answer'd, that though there should be no Resurrection of the dead, yet it follows not that they were Baptised in vain, for that Sacred Office of Baptism was thought in that case (and that rightly too) chiefly to have respect to what was Past. Though the dead bodies rise not, yet that Administration was useful to the Soul, and available

to

to the Absolution and Remission of their sins; which plainly appears from the Reason of deferring baptism heretofore, namely, lest they should sin, and so defile themselves after washing. Though the dead should never rise again, Christs Ordinance might be conducible to this Present Life, whilst by That they were admitted into the Church, and had their former sins washed away, and their consciences cleansed: and also it might be serviceable to the Future Life, for the salvation and happiness of their Souls, though their Bodies were unconcerned. But 4ly, to say no more, This Interpretation of the words is faulty in the same kind that the two former were, that is, it is irreconcileable to the Propriety of speech, and the Usage of the Tongue in which the Apostle wrote: which I cannot but believe till it is proved to me that These two are of the same import, *viz. to be baptized for the dead*, and *to be baptized when they are dying*, or *at their death*: which is the thing that the Abettors of this Exposition contend for; but it could never yet be made out by any Parallel place of Scripture, or the least Testimony of Approved Authors.

5. Another Acception of the words

is

is countenanced by the Authority of *Luther*, *Piscator*, and the Admirable *Vossius* in his *Thesis concerning the Resurrection*. They will have ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, rendred by ὑπεράνω τῶν νεκρῶν, *over the dead*, i. e. over the dead corps as they lay in the *Cæmeteries* or Burying places: or *over the dead*, i. e. *upon* the Tombs, and *over* the Sepulchres of the newly deceased Martyrs, which were call'd *Memoriæ Martyrum*, and so the words refer to the Custom of baptizing persons over the dead Martyrs graves or tombs. Here first, I shall grant that according to the *Syriack* it is rendred *super mortuos*, *upon*, *above*, or *over the dead*. Secondly, I grant that the Innocent Commemorations of the Holy Martyrs, even at the Time of administring of Baptism, were no unusual things of old, and have Great Antiquity to Assert them. But then, This I have to say that ὑπὲρ for ὑπεράνω is not so Easie and Obvious an Acception as That which I have to offer (and certainly the Easiest and Plainest is to be deemed the most Natural and Genuine.) Again, though the *Præposition* in the Text frequently signifies *over* or *above*, and that with a Genitive case, when it is applied to a

place,

place, yet it may be queſtion'd whether it hath the ſame ſignification when it is joyned with *perſons*, as here: for though the baptizing be ſuppoſed to be over the *Graves*, yet it is properly over *thoſe that are dead*, who are conſidered as *perſons* here: at leaſt their *bodies*, not the *places* they were in, are ſpoken of here. But I will not inſiſt on this, but will rather ſuppoſe it to be Good Greek for the ſake of the Chief Author of this Opinion, the Admirable *Voſſius*, who was as Eminent a Grammarian as he was a Divine. But further, I could object againſt this Cuſtom as a *Superſtitious one*, and therefore not fit to be made an Argument of the *Reſurrection* by St *Paul*. Again, if this Ceremony of adminiſtring Baptiſm *over the dead* were wholly void of *Superſtition*, yet I am not ſatisfied that That Practice was at all in uſe in our *Apoſtle*'s time. Nay, the *Evangelical Hiſtory* is againſt it, for we read there that [a] *Jordan* and [b] *Ænon*, not *Church-yards* and *Vaults*, but *Rivers* were made uſe of for Baptizing: although it is true *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* relates that in After-Ages the *Fonts* and the *Graves* were together, the *Baptiſteria* and the *Martyrs Tombs* were cloſe to one another.

[a] *John* 1. 28.
[b] *John* 3. 23.

But that they were ſo at Firſt, and that the *Memoriæ Martyrum*, ſo often ſpoken of in S. *Cyprian*, and S. *Auguſtin*, were as old as the Apoſtles, I have no where read. Or, if we ſhould ſuppoſe there was ſuch a Cuſtom then, yet That could not be applyed by our Apoſtle to the preſent purpoſe, for it cannot be proved that they that were ſo Baptized over the Tombs did profeſs thereby *to believe the Reſurrection*; for they might do this to ſhew that they would in ſome ſort be *like the dead*, which is the thing Chriſtians profeſs in Baptiſm, as the Apoſtle tells us. Therefore I am not convinced that the words before us have any Alluſion to ſuch a practice.

[f] Juſtellus (*ad Can.* 12. *Concil. Neocæſar.*) Scaliger (*l.* 3 *Epiſt.* 236 & 237 *Epiſt.*) Eraſmus, Caſaubon, Grotius.

6. There are ſome Learned men who fetch the ſenſe of theſe words from a Cuſtom which they read of in *Tertullian* and *Epiphanius*, which was This, when any of the *Catechumeni* were ſuddenly ſnatched away by death (before they could have time and leiſure to approach to the Holy Laver of Baptiſm) ſome of the ſurviving friends were intreated to be baptized for them, *viz.* in their ſtead: and the perſons that were deceaſed, though unbaptized, were reputed to be baptized, becauſe they were ſo in their

Repreſentatives. Ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν then is as much as ἀντὶ τῶν νεκρῶν, *vice vel loco mortuorum*, in the room and place of the dead. And that the Præpoſition bears that as well as other ſignifications is not to be doubted, there being abundant Authority to confirm it. I ſhall help to ſtrengthen it with a Remarkable quotation which looks as like This of our Apoſtle as may be. It is out of *Dionyſius* of *Halicarnaßus* (8th book) ἔφη (ſaith he) τὴν ἀρχὴν καθαλαβόντας ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀποθανόντων ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ στρατιωτῶν ἄξιον ἑτέρους καταγράφειν, i. e. the Magiſtrates would have other ſouldiers enrolled and admitted in the room of thoſe who died in the war. Theſe two Examples ὑπὲρ ἀποθανόντων & ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν ſeem to be very nearly allied, but really are not. However, from the former of theſe it is evident that ὑπὲρ ſometimes is as much as ἀντὶ. And there are abundant Inſtances in the New Teſtament that this Præpoſition ſignifies a *Subſtitution*, a putting one perſon in the place of another, as [s] *Grotius* hath proved ſufficiently againſt the *Socinians*, who will by no means have it denote a Subſtitution or Surrogation. So that I muſt confeſs I wonder at what a Great Critick ſaith

[s] *De Satisfactione.*

concerning This Interpretation, *vice mortuorum, viz.* [h] that he doth not know that any body ever ſpeaks after this manner. Whereas it is apparent that This is an Uſual and Common way of ſpeaking, and is to be met with frequently in the Beſt Writers: wherefore it muſt be imputed to the Forgetfulneſs of that Great Scholar that he delivers any ſuch thing. Having ſpoken hitherto of the *Grammatical* part of the Opinion, now let us conſider the *Cuſtom* on which it is founded. Firſt then, ſuppoſe there was ſuch a Cuſtom of old among the *Marcionites* or *Cerinthians*, or both (for [i] *Tertullian* imputes it to the *Marcionites*, and ſo doth *Chryſoſtom*, but [k] *Epiphanius* relates it as an Hereſie of the *Cerinthians*,) yet neither of theſe Fathers acquaint us that it obtained in the days when S[t] *Paul* or *Cerinthus* lived; and therefore there is no evidence that the Apoſtle had notice of any ſuch thing, and conſequently he could not mention it in his Writings. But let us *ſuppoſe* (what we cannot *grant*) that even whilſt the Apoſtle lived, ſuch a practice was more rarely and privately uſed, yet it is not credible that St *Paul*, the Great Maſter of Logick and Diſcourſe, would argue

[h] *Nemo ita loquitur quod ſciam.* Heinſ. *Exerc. Sac.*

[i] *De Reſurrect. carn. cap.* 48. *& contr. Marcion. l.* 5, *c.* 10.

[k] *Hæreſ.* 28.

argue from a thing ſo Obſcure and Apocryphal, and not openly received at that time, eſpecially in a Catholick Epiſtle, directed not only to the *Corinthian* Church, but *unto all that in every place call upon the name of Jeſus Chriſt our Lord* (as you read in the front of this Epiſtle, v. 2.) But this is not all, Shall it be thought worthy of the clear and demonſtrative Reaſon of him that was brought up at the feet of *Gamaliel*, to build the Great Doctrine of the *Reſurrection* on a Vain Obſervance and a Manifeſt Error of ſome Conceited Hereticks? If there were ſuch a thing as a Poſthumous Baptiſm (if I may ſo call it,) a Repreſentative Waſhing, *Vicarium Baptiſma*, as *Tertullian* ſtiles it, a Sacrament by a Proxy or Deputy, even when the party moſt concern'd was in another world, if you can imagine that there was ſuch a thing as This in the *Apoſtle's* days, yet can you think likewiſe that this is the thing deſign'd in Theſe words? Could ſo vain and Idle a Rite come into the Apoſtle's mind upon This occaſion? Would he argue from a Vain Abuſe of Baptiſm by Hereticks? Would the Apoſtle proceed upon the Errors of others? This would be no Simple and Abſolute Proof, but

it would only be ſignificant to thoſe Erroneous perſons, by bringing them by this Arguing to an Inconvenience. Nay, can you imagine that this Holy man would ſo lightly paſs by and overlook ſo Groſs an Abuſe of the Baptiſmal Inſtitution, that he would not reflect in the leaſt on ſo Notorious a Pollution of that Sacrament, when he had taken particular notice of the very Poſtures and Habit of the *Corinthians*, of the *mens Praying Veiled*, and of *the womens Praying Unveiled* in the Publick Congregations, and likewiſe of the *Length and Wearing of their Hair*, and had reproved them for theſe diſorders? Why would he *now* be ſilent, or (I may ſay) diſſemble, when he had at other times ſmartly checked leſſer Errors and Obliquities? St *Chryſoſtom* in his Homily on This 15th Chap. of the 1 Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, relates the *manner* of this Abſurd practice of thoſe *Hereticks*, where he tells us that they uſed to put a Living man under the bed of the Deceaſed, and then the dead perſon was asked whether he would be Baptized: whereupon he that was under the bed made Anſwer for the dead, and deſired Baptiſm, and him they immediately baptized in the place of the dead.

dead. This the Good Father relates there at large, but he tells his Auditors before hand, that [l] he knows he ſhall in rehearſing the Antick Cuſtom of thoſe Heretick's move them to no little laughter, it being a piece of mere Mockery, an Hiſtrionical Sacrament, a Ludicrous Prophanation of Baptiſm, for thoſe Ridiculous Sectaries (as he expreſſes it) did but [m] act a Part in a Play. Can it be imagined then that ſo Weighty and Solid an Article as the *Reſurrection* is, can be founded on ſo Slight and Abſurd a bottom? St *Paul* needed not to have ſought for Aides from falſhood and Error, when the Truth it ſelf is ſufficiently Armed, and hath Auxiliaries enough of its own to defend its cauſe. I might add alſo, that This Practice ſuppoſes a Reiterating of the Sacrament of Baptiſm, which is an Abſurd thing; unleſs it be ſaid that thoſe perſons were baptized only for Others: but then it cannot be denied that at the ſame time they were really Baptized Themſelves. This Meaning of the words therefore will but little Credit our Apoſtle, and therefore I have the leſs Eſteem for it. And I have none at all for that which follows, *viz.*

[l] Οἶδα μὲν ὅτι πολὺν κινήσω γέλωτα.

[m] καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς παίζοντες.

7. The Opinion of the Learned [n] *Joſeph*

[n] *Not. in N.T.*

ſeph Scaliger, according to whom *the baptized for the dead*, are thoſe who are *baptized for the benefit and advantage of the dead*. It is granted indeed that This might be True according to the Letter, or Grammatical part, for ὑπὲρ ſometimes is as much as *in utilitatem ſeu commodum* in Good Authors. And accordingly it is ſaid often in the New Teſtament that Chriſt died ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, not only *in our ſtead*, but *for us*, i. e. for our Good and Advantage, *viz.* that he might purchaſe Salvation and Eternal Happineſs for us. But the *meaning* which the aforeſaid Author conveys to us by This Conſtruction is intolerably Abſurd and Superſtitious; and it is no other then This, that the Apoſtle here in mentioning the ſuſception of *Baptiſm for the dead*, points at ſome Pious Office of *Bathing or Baptizing the dead*, or *being Baptized for them in order to the Refreſhment of their ſouls*. The riſe of it, he ſaith, was This, that the Antients thought the ſouls of the dead were Impriſon'd in the earth till the day of Judgment, which he labours to prove out of *Tertullian*, *Auguſtin*, and *Lactantius*: and from That Error, ſaith this Great man, was propagated the doctrine of

of Christs Descent into Hell. Now people were mightily concerned for these Close Prisoners, and they were desirous to purchase some Refreshing for the souls of their friends and relations. To this purpose they frequently Pray'd, and made Oblations for them, and they were willing to do Any thing, that their departed friends might fare as well as might be till the Last day. And on this same ground they used *Baptism for the dead*, and that annually on a certain day, *viz.* the Calends of *February*, as [o] *Tertullian* saith expressly: and even to this day, saith *Scaliger*, some of the *Ethiopian* Church yearly renew their Baptism at the Feast of *Epiphany*; which very thing [p] *Vossius* also testifies of the *Ethiopian* Christians. And *Scaliger* explains This Custom yet further out of *Lactantius* and St *Augustin*, and rangeth it among the *Ineptiæ Patrum & Ecclesiæ Doctorum*, The Dotages of the Primitive Church. Hence, saith he, is the Apostle's heavy Censure of the *Corinthians* in the 34 v. of this Chapter, *some have not the knowledge of God: I speak this to your shame*, From which words this Mighty Critick would prove that the Practice, from which the Argument in the Text is drawn, was no ways

[o] *Contr. Marcion. l. 5.*

[p] *Disputat. 17. de Baptismo.*

ways Good and Laudable, though the Argument it self which the Apostle useth be solid enough. But this is a Mistake, for when it is said, *Some have not the knowledge of God*, it is apparent that it strikes at those who denied or questioned the *Resurrection of the dead*, as you may easily be convinced by perusing what immediately follows in 35 & 36 v. *Some man will say, how are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickned except it die*; and v. 38. *God giveth it a body as it pleaseth him.* From whence it is clear that the fond and foolish reasoning of the *Corinthians* about the manner of the *Resurrection*, and their shamefull ignorance of the Almighty power of God concerning it, are the things which the Apostle there rebukes them for. He tells them that *some have not the knowledge of God*, in the same sense that our Saviour reproved the Sadducees, saying, *Ye do erre, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God*, Mat. 22. 29. And as for the use of that Officious Baptizing for the benefit of the dead, (which *Scaliger* thinks is intended in this place,) before it gain our assent, 'tis to be proved, that that fond and Idle Rite had

had a being in the *Apoſtle's days*, and was well known to the *Corinthians*, which is not yet Proved, and ſo he cannot be thought to have an eye to any ſuch thing. Or, if we ſhould be ſo liberal of our Conceſſions as to grant that ſuch a Cuſtom was on foot when the Apoſtle writ this Epiſtle (which it is utterly impoſſible to prove) yet have we no reaſon to think (unleſs we can ſwallow down the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, and perſwade our ſelves that that Officious Waſhing was available to cool thoſe Flames) unleſs, I ſay, we can digeſt this, we have no reaſon to believe that the Preſent Argument is drawn thence. But on the contrary, it is highly rational to maintain, that This paſſage of St *Paul*, and That of St *Peter* in his 1 Epiſt. 3^d Chap. and 19th v. (of which we ſhall next ſpeak,) with other places of Sacred Writ, have been forcibly drawn by perverſe men to patronize the Gainfull doctrine of *Satisfaction* for the reſcuing of ſouls out of the priſon of *Purgatory*. Beſides, I might ask, what doth freeing from Purgatory, which happens before the Reſurrection, conduce to the *confirming the Reſurrection*? They are, they ſay, *baptized for the dead*, to free

free their freinds from Purgatory, but That may be though there be no Resurrection: for it is the Soul, not the Body that ſuffers the pains of Purgatory. Nay further, it doth not appear that even in After-Ages the practice which *Scaliger* ſpeaks of did prevail, *viz.* that the Living were baptized *for the Benefit of the dead.* For the Annual Baptizing on a certain day, which he alledgeth for his purpoſe, argues no ſuch thing. It was done only in remembrance and reverence of *Chriſts Baptiſm*, which was performed by St *John* on the *Calends of February*, according to ſome, or on the *Epiphany*, according to others. That day is call'd φώσφορος ἡμέρα by the Antients, either becauſe of *John Baptiſt* the *Forerunner*, the True Evangelical *Phoſphorus*, or becauſe [9] φωτίζεσθαι was βαπτίζεσθαι. He that conſults the Antients ſhall find that they generally aſſert Chriſt was Born and Baptized on the ſame day of the year, which they think they prove from *Luke* 3. 23. This day being, according to their opinion, ſo ſignalized by our Saviours Birth and Baptiſm, was reputed a very High day, and was in Great Eſteem among them; in ſo much it ſeems that they repeated their Own Bap-

[9] Τὰς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας. *Heb.* 6. 4.

Baptiſm on that day. And for this reaſon ſome of the *Abiſſine* Chriſtians (whom *Scaliger* calls the *Ethiopian Church*) yearly Baptize themſelves in Rivers and Lakes on *Epiphany* day. And I could add from a Late Author, that the Biſhops in *Muſcovy* at this day conſecrate the Rivers on the *Epiphany* every year. But what is all this to the purpoſe? Is here any Baptizing *for the benefit of the dead?* No aſſuredly. I am ready to grant alſo, that *Baptizing of the dead* was uſed heretofore by ſome Chriſtians. This is as certain as that it was uſual to give the Other Sacrament to the dead: *which both* appear to have been Practiſed from the Sixth Canon of the 3d Council of *Carthage*, and the 83 of the Council of *Trullo*, in which you find a Prohibition againſt that adminiſtring the Euchariſt and Baptiſm to the bodies of the deceaſed. And the above named [r] *Canoniſts* in their Comments on the 18th Canon of *Carthage*, acquaint us with the Ground of this Baptizing the dead, and likewiſe of the Baptizing the living in the room of the dead, namely, upon the Miſunderſtanding theſe words of the Apoſtle, *What ſhall they do that are baptized for the dead?* The *Jews* it ſeems had

[r] *Balſamon & Zonaras.*

had the like Superſtitious opinion and practice as to *Circumciſion*; for [f] *Buxtorf* acquaints us, that the Infant that died before it was eight days old was Circumciſed in the Burying-place, over the grave. And that is yet more Fond, which I have read of a people among the *Tartars*, who had ſo great an opinion of *Matrimony*, that if their ſons and daughters died before Age, they ſolemnized a Marriage between the parties after death. Such a piece of Folly was *the Baptizing of the dead*, which was practiſed (we grant) in ſome Ages after the Apoſtles, and Thoſe *Learned Lawyers* think it was founded on the Text. Yet any Unprejudiced man may ſee that there is not the leaſt foundation in the words for ſuch a Practiſe: for it is impoſſible to make Theſe two one, *Baptizing the dead*, or *baptizing perſons when they are dead*, and *being Baptized for the Benefit of the dead*.

[f] *Synagoga.*

8. There is another Opinion which may be referred to This Firſt Rank of Interpreters, and that is, that the Apoſtle ſpeaks here of the Cuſtom received in the Church *of giving Names in Baptiſm in memory of the dead*. This, ſaith [t] *Heinſius* (who is the only Expoſitor

[t] *In Exercitat. Sacr. in locum.*

positor that goes this way) was in use among the Old Christians, and thence the *Nomindlia* were instituted and solemnly observed by them, which were Festival days kept by the Christians yearly in remembrance of the *Names* given them in Baptism. These *Nomindlia* (as *Tertullian* calls them) or *Genesia* (as *Gregory Nazianzen* stiles them) were first derived from the Jews in Circumcision, at which time the Infants had the Names given them of their Parents or Nearest Kindred and Friends deceased (which is confirmed in the Evangelical History by that dispute which was about the Naming of St *John* the Baptist.) And this usage prevailed in the *Christian* Church afterwards, and they were wont to give their Children the Names of their Kindred who had excell'd in vertue; for these were thought to inspire them by their Worthy Examples. And by this means also the Names of their departed friends were Recorded, and their Memories preserved, and they seem'd to Survive in those that bore their Names. These were said to be *Baptized for the dead*, i.e. (saith that Learned Critick,) *in gratiam & memoriam mortuorum.* They might justly

be

be said [illegible] to *raise up the Name of the dead*, as those were said to do among the *Jews*, who being next of kin married the widow of the deceased. The Apostle then is thought by Him to refer to That giving of the *Names of the dead* to those that were *Baptized*, because That was in Memory and Honour of the expired friends, in hope of their *Resurrection*, and in belief of *Eternity*; for though they were Dead, yet they really Lived in another world. Thus therefore the Argument is supposed to run, Why are those Names of departed Parents and Friends given to the Baptized Relations, if those persons are not at all in being? To what purpose were this if the Deceased utterly perished, and after death were never to rise again? The *Resurrection* supposeth the Souls Immortality, and so believing This we cannot question the Other. The persons wearing the *Names* of those that are dead, do hereby tell the world that they believe their Pious Parents and Friends are still in being, and at the last day shall rise again. What shall they do, how fondly do they act who are thus baptized themselves, or baptize others in Memory of the Dead, if they believe

not

not the Reſurrection? elſe why do they conſider the Deceaſed as yet Living when they give or bear the Names of thoſe perſons? The Anſwer to all this in ſhort is, 1. If ſuch a cuſtom was in the Apoſtles times, yet it ſeems to be too Particular and too Mean a one to ground ſo Great and General a matter on. 2. Tis not giving or receiving a Name that is here ſpoken of, but *Baptizing*, which is another thing, and of more moment. And why *Baptiſm* ſhould be put here for *Impoſition of Names* in Baptiſm I ſee no reaſon, unleſs it could be proved that an Improper Acception of a word is more agreeable then the Proper and Native one. 3. It is not evident that Names were generally and commonly given at Baptiſm ſo early. If we conſult the Hiſtory even of the Times ſoon after Chriſt, we ſhall read of very few (which I ſomewhat wonder at, I confeſs) who bore the Names either of the Evangeliſts or Apoſtles, or other Martyrs. 4. To argue from the Impoſition of the Names of the dead to their Certain Riſing again is no ways firm and ſolid. And therefore it is not probable on Theſe Conſiderations that This was the ſenſe of the Apoſtle.

9. In the next place I will propound the Opinion of that late Learned Critick *Alexander More*, who in his Notes on ſome Select places of the New Teſtament, underſtands this place of the *Sacramental Baptiſm*, but by *the dead* (which in the Greek is in the *Plural*) he thinks is denoted a *Singular Perſon*, and that perſon is *Chriſt*: and to *be baptized for the dead*, is to be *baptized for Chriſt*, the meaning of which you may find in that Author. I will only here take notice of the Unreaſonableneſs of his Interpretation, ſo far as he underſtands *Chriſt* by *thoſe that are dead*. It is true I grant that there are ſeveral Examples of the change of the Singular number for the Plural in Holy Scripture. This *Syllepſis*, or *Synechdoche*, or *Enallage numeri* (call it as you pleaſe) is frequent in the Sacred Stile, and it is moſt uſed when ſome Eminent Perſon or Thing is meant. And I grant that Chriſt was the moſt Eminent Perſon, and his Death the moſt Signal and Remarkable Thing that ever was. But I cannot think that the Apoſtle *here* expreſſes the Singular by the Plural, becauſe 1. the Apoſtle here mentions *the dead three times*, which ſhews he means it in the true proper ſenſe.

ſenſe. For it were tolerable to put the Plural for the Singular once, but to *repeat* it is unuſual, much more to ſpeak after the ſame manner a *third time* is not to be allowed. Where you meet with the *Change of Numbers* in Scripture, it is *by the by*, and not frequent; but this Reiterating of it is no where to be found, which is an Argument that [*the dead*] here is no ſuch kind of ſpeech, but that it is a way of ſpeaking after the ordinary rate, and conſequently that one Number is not put for another. 2. All along in this Chapter *Chriſt* is ſpoken of, and repreſented *as Riſen*; how comes it to paſs that the Character is here altered, and that now by *the Dead* (thrice named) we muſt underſtand *Chriſt*? 3. When we can ſatisfie ourſelves very well with the *Propriety* of ſpeech, we have no reaſon to fancy *Improprieties*, and then to flie to that meaning which is contain'd in them. This is our preſent caſe, the Apoſtle here ſpeaks in the Plural, and we can very well underſtand him. Why muſt we imagine that he intends the Singular when he expreſſes himſelf Plurally? Why muſt we make him ſpeak Improperly when we can apprehend him as well, nay better in his

Proper way of ſpeaking? Thus we have no good ground to think that ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν is put for ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν.

There is another Interpretation yet remaining, even of thoſe who take *Baptizing* here in the *Sacramental ſenſe*. But That being the Interpretation which I ſhall fix upon as the moſt Probable and Accountable, I will therefore reſerve it for the Cloſe of all.

Thus far we have examined thoſe *Expoſitions* of the Text which make it to be underſtood of *Sacramental Waſhing*, ſignally ſtiled *Baptiſm*.

II. There are a Second ſort of Expoſitors who will have the words meant of *the Waſhing of the dead bodies in order to Burial*: and of this opinion *Beza* is the chief Patron, in his *Annotations* on the place, and he is followed by *Pareus*. It was indeed an ordinary practice to *waſh the corps* before their Interment, and what S. *Luke* tells us of *Tabitha*, in *Acts* 9. 37. is a Confirmation of it. 'Tis likely, ſay theſe Authors, that this was done in belief and expectation of the *Riſing again* of thoſe bodies; and therefore it is probable the Apoſtle argues from the received rite and cuſtom of *Waſhing the bodies of the dead* before

before they layd them in the grave, for this Glesping (and Anointing too, for that also was usual) was a visible profession of the belief of a future Resurrection. What shall they do that make use of this Sepulcral Washing, to what purpose do they observe this rite if the flesh be never to rise again? Τι ποιουσι; what doth this action of theirs signifie? to what end is it? why are all nations solicitous about the liveless carcass? to what tends all this care of theirs if the body shall not experience the happiness of a Restauration? The Reply to this is easie, 1. The notion of *baptizing* according to this interpretation, is forced and distorted, for though βαπτισμὸς may and doth signifie *Washing* in the more General sense, and is applied to *Common Washings*, in *Mark* 7. 4. & *Heb.* 9. 10. yet there is no reason to relinquish the more Noted Acception of it in the stile of the New Testament: and here to restrain it to the custom of *Funeral Washing* is very odd and unaccountable. 2. Though the Christians used this sort of Sepulcral Washing, yet how doth it appear that This was a Proof of the *Resurrection of the dead*? *Durandus* in his *Rationale* tells you that the Christians washed the

dead, to shew that their Souls were cleans'd from sin by Confession and Penitence. 3. This Funeral Washing was in use among the *Jews* as well as those that profess'd Christianity. Now 'tis known that the *Sadducees* acknowledged no such thing as a *Resurrection*, and therefore their Washing the dead could have no respect to the Rising again of the dead. Again, 4^ly, the *Ablutio Mortuali* (as *Plautus* calls it) was used by the *Pagans* as well as Christians; and it is not to be thought that These did it with regard to the *Resurrection*. You may learn why they washed the dead bodies from *Servius*, *viz.* that if the vital spirits in those that seem'd to be dead were only benum'd, they might be revived and rouzed by the warm water, and rubbing it on the body. But it is more probable in my opinion that they *Washed* the dead bodies in order to *Anointing them*, for the *Romans* and *Grecians* and other Nations used both these, and one made way for the other, for they first clear'd the Skin of its pollution, and then made use of their Perfumed Ointments. *Virgil* giving account of *Misenus*'s Funeral Obsequies, takes notice of this practice,

[a] *Quod videlicet plerumque putetur exclusus vitalis spiritus, qui calidæ aquæ ablutione veluti sopitus excitatur. In Æneid. 2.*

* *Post*

x *Poſt calidos lavices, & ahena undantia flammis*
Expediunt, corpuſq; lavant frigentis, & ungunt. x Æneid. 6.

And *Ennius* doth the like, ſpeaking of deceaſed *Tarquin*,

Tarquinii corpus bona famina lavit & unxit.

And y *Homer* deſcribes *Patroclus*'s funerals after the ſame manner. And by the by, I might inſert that it is probable they *Waſhed* our *Saviours* body, ſeeing we read that z *Mary Magdalen* and other women *Anointed* it after his death, as did alſo a *Joſeph of Arimathea* and *Nicodemus*. b S. *Chryſoſtom* is Poſitive that Chriſts body was *Waſhed* after he was taken down from the Croſs. Thus *Jews* as well as *Other people* uſed this Funeral Ceremony of *Waſhing* the dead body, it being in order to *Anointing*: for it was proper firſt to waſh off the filth of the body before they laid on their ſweet Ointments. Or, what think you of *another Reaſon* of the Cuſtom, which I have framed to my ſelf, from what I meet with in the *Pagan* Antiquities? There I find that Waſhing the Infants that were newly born was a conſtant practice: not only c *Plautus*, but ſeveral Others take notice of it, and the very Sacred Records expreſsly mention it,

y Iliad 9.

z Mark 16. 1.
a John 19. 38, 39, 40.
b Homil. 84 in Johan.

c Poſtquam peperit, pueros lavare juſſit. In Amphitryon.

Ezek. 16. 4. and thereby confirm the Antiquity of this cuſtom. Perhaps therefore *Waſhing after death* was an imitation of the *Waſhing at the birth*. Their Entring into the world, and their Leaving it had the like [d] *Names*, and they would have them reſemble one another in the like *Actions*. It is probable they agreed upon it to End as they Began, at Coming into and Going out of the world to uſe the ſame Cuſtom. But if This Conjecture be not admitted, then we muſt have recourſe to the former Accounts given of This Uſage, or we may yet further add that the generality of the people who uſed the *Luſtral Waſhing*, did it either out of ſome Superſtitious humour, or barely to comply with Cuſtom. Take it in any of theſe Aſpects, it doth not look like an *Argument* that the Apoſtle would make uſe of for the proof of the *Reſurrection*. 5. To ſay no more, the Criticizing genius of this Modern Expoſitor fails him here, for what Conſtruction can reconcile theſe two, and make them the ſame, *viz.* the *waſhing of the dead* (i. e. waſhing perſons after they are dead) and *waſhing for the dead*? Theſe are vaſtly different, and it was never heard that there was any

[d] γένεσις, γενέθλια, γενέσια, *Plutarch. Sympoſ. l.* 8. *Ammian. Marcellin.*

any Affinity betwen the one and the other. Therefore this Sepulchral Waſhing ought to be diſſallowed here; Grammer will not vouch it: Which is a ſufficient confutation of the Opinion, though there were nothing elſe to ſay.

III. A *Third* ſort of Interpreters are (as fondly) of opinion that the words refer to a *Legal and Ceremonious Waſhing uſed among the Jews after their touching of a dead body, or going into the Sepulchres, or ſtanding too near the perſons that were breathing their laſt.* The Pollution which they contracted by this means was to be purged away by *Waſhing themſelves.* And indeed it happens that the word βαπτίζεσθαι is applied to This ſort of Cleanſing by the *Apochryphal* Author, in *Eccleſ.* 34. 25. Nay St *Mark* applies the word in this ſenſe, *Mark* 7. 4. *Except they waſh* (or be baptized) *they eat not.* And the *Arabick* Verſion of the Text ſeems to favour this opinion, which renders it thus, [e] 'What ſhall they do that are baptized becauſe of *the dead perſons, viz.* whom they have Touched, and ſo Polluted themſelves? [f] *Hottinger* therefore underſtands the Apoſtle of this *Ceremonial Baptiſm of the Old Teſtament* (as he calls it)

[e] *Quid facient qui pro perſonis mortuis baptizantur?*

[f] *In Cipp. Hebraic.*

it) which he ſaith was inſtituted to remind the *Iſraelites* of the Reſurrection of the dead. But I do not find that he hath gain'd any conſiderable Proſelytes to his opinion, it being ſo ſorrily contrived, and having ſo little reaſon to rely upon. For to be baptized or waſhed ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν *for the dead*, and ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν *from the dead*, i. e. from the pollution contracted by touching or coming near the dead, are vaſtly different. Waſhing themſelves after their being defiled by a dead body, what is that to *Waſhing for the dead?* And as this *Moſaick Waſhing* hath no *Grammer*, ſo neither hath it any *Logick* to appear in its behalf, for it miſerably perverts the ſenſe of the words, and the Conſequence of the Apoſtle's diſcourſe, which I leave you to examine.

And ſo doth that Other Opinion of *Turrianus* the Jeſuite, who will needs have this *baptizing for the dead* relate to *a Legal Waſhing or Purifying of the dead bodies*. It is his fancy that the Apoſtle argues from the practice of the *Jews*, among whom it was uſual that if any man died Legally unclean (i. e. before he was purified from his Uncleanneſs according to the Law, *Num.* 19.) ſome other

other person was washed and cleansed in his stead: for they thought, saith he, that this Purging profited the dead, and by this means the Uncleanness which he died in would not hurt him, nay that he should be thereby cleansed: and by this Ceremony too they professed their faith of the Immortality of the soul and the Resurrection of the dead, against the heresie of the Sadducees. But the naming of this Conceit is enough to confute it: for first, there is no proof that there ever was any such Practice; Secondly, there is no reason to think that the Apostle by *Baptizing* means any other then *Sacramental Baptism*; Thirdly, any man may guess that the Jesuite chiefly design'd this Exposition for the sake of his so much admired doctrine of *Purgatory*.

And for that end have *Others of the Church of Rome* fastned another, but as improbable a Meaning on the words. Which brings me to the *Last* rank of Interpreters, *viz.*

IV. Those that will have the *Baptizing* in the Text to be understood in a *Metaphorical* sense. It is the dream of *Stapleton* and *Salmeron*, and some others of that party, that because by *Baptism* or *Washing*

Washing, is meant *Affliction* or *Suffering*, in *Matt.* 20. 23. therefore the persons who are said to be *baptized for the dead*, are such Kind souls who, to do the dead a Courtesie, undergo all sorts of Afflictions and Hardships. As if S. *Paul* had said, What shall they do who voluntarily suffer so much in This world to help those that are in misery in another? What shall they do that baptize themselves as 'twere in their Sweat and Tears, and bathe themselves in their own Blood to redeem poor souls from the pains of Purgatory? What will become of them that do and suffer any thing for the advantage of the dead, if the dead shall not rise? Why do they inure themselves to Long Prayers and tedious Fastings? Why do they undergo the Baptism of *Penance* and *Almsdeeds*? (for *Bellarmine* understands it so, and *Salmeron* upon the place tells us, that *Alms* are a kind of *Washing*, for which he quoteth forsooth *Ecclesiasticus* 3. 30. *Water will quench a flaming fire, and Alms maketh an atonement for sins*; and Luke 11. 4. *Give alms, and behold, all things are Clean unto you.*) Why do so many undertake Long Pilgrimages, wear Hair Shirts, roll themselves in Snow, Scourge and Torture them-

themselves, and go through all the hard-ships of Self-denial, if they do not think These things will prove *Satisfactions* for disobedient souls? Why do they relinquish the world, and study nothing but Severity and Mortifications and Austere Exercises of their bodies, if they could not by These Arts do the Dead some good? Why are they thus *baptized* or *afflicted* for the dead? Certainly this Baptizing will mitigate the flames of Purgatory, and inable the distressed Prisoners to get loose the sooner out of that Painfull Durance. That which I have to Reply to This is 1. that it is an odd Notion and Way of these men to reckon *Repentance*, and *Prayers* and *Almsdeeds*, among *Afflictions* and *Sufferings* and *Punishments*. This is a doctrine which no Divines but themselves ever taught. 2. Let it be remembred that although Penances for the dead were in use among the *Pagans*, yet Gods People were particularly forbid to use any such thing, *Deut.* 14. 1. *Ye shall not cut your selves, nor make any baldness between your eyes for the dead.* And shall not *Christians* think it unlawful as well as *Jews*? 3. Any man may see that This is a plain fetch to establish That Doctrine which hath brought

the

the Church of *Rome* ſo much Profit, and therefore muſt be maintain'd right or wrong. 4. Whereas they ſay the end of theſe Services and Undertakings of the living for the Dead is that the Souls detain'd in Purgatory may be releaſed; I reply that this is fondly alledged, becauſe Purgatory is not a Priſon for Bodies but for Souls only (as they confeſs.) Now I never heard of the *Reſurrection* of *Souls*, but of *Bodies*; and of This the Apoſtle ſpeaks, *If the dead riſe not at all*; meaning it of the *Bodies of the dead*. So that This Text hath no reference to what they dream of. It ſpeaks of another thing, unleſs *Soul* and *Body* are the ſame thing. 5. It were enough to ſay that this *Obſcure* and *Myſtical* notion of being *Baptized*, is but ſeldom uſed in the Stile of Scripture, and then (one place of St *Luke* excepted) it hath an Explanation added after it, as [8] *Voſſius* hath well obſerved. There can be no reaſon therefore, in This place eſpecially, to think that This *Allegorical Baptiſm*, i. e. the *Baptiſm of Suffering*, is intended.

[8] *Theſ. de Reſurrect. carn.*

I might annex here the Opinion of our Learned Rabbi Dr *Lightfoot*, who is the only *Proteſtant* of any note, except *Voſſius*, who interprets this

place

place of the *Metaphorical Baptiſm*, the Baptiſm of Suffering. *What ſhall they do that are baptized for the dead, if the dead* &c. is as much, ſaith he, as if the Apoſtle had ſaid, [b] *If the dead riſe not again, what will become of thoſe that are baptized with a Martyrial Baptiſm, or that do ſuffer Death for the profeſſion of the Truth?* And he adds, to confirm this Interpretation, that the *Jewiſh Baptizings or Dippings in their purifications were a very ſharp piece of Religion, when in froſt and ſnow, and wind and weather, they muſt over head and ears in cold water, from which the phraſe was uſed to ſignifie Death and the Bitterneſs Sufferings.* Whence he gathers that *Baptiſm for the dead* in this place, is ſuffering of Martyrdom: and conſequently he makes this to be the ſenſe of the Text, *What ſhall they do who have or do undergo Martyrdom? what ſhall become of them if their bodies riſe not again?* Thus he. But who ſees not that this is a very groundleſs notion, and taken up only from that *Jewiſh* way of ſpeaking which he mentions? whereas, if we conſider it well, there is no affinity at all between the one and the other. Though the *Jewiſh Baptiſms* might be made uſe of to expreſs

[b] Harmony of the N. Teſt.

preſs *Great Severities*, yea *Death* it ſelf, yet what is this to *being baptized for the dead*? Baptiſm may repreſent Martyrdom, but who can reaſonably thence infer that *the baptized for the dead* in this place are thoſe that were *Martyred*? There is not the leaſt Connection between theſe two. It muſt be ſaid then that this Worthy and Reverend perſon eſpouſed this notion merely upon the account of that great reverence which he always paid to the Jewiſh and Rabinical Writings, of which moſt of his Opinions have a tincture.

There are ſome *Other* odd fancies which I have met with on the words; as that of *Lyranus*, *Lombard* and *Aquinas*, who by *the dead* underſtand *mortal ſins*, called by the Apoſtle *dead works*, *Heb.* 9. 1. & 6. 14. for the expiation and waſhing away of which Holy Baptiſm was ordained. But their own *Stapleton* refutes This, ſaying the Apoſtle ſpeaks not of *Sins* but *Men*, not of *Works*, but *Perſons*. This and the reſt of this ſort I paſs by, as unwilling to entertain you with Trifles. Some of the Other Interpretations before mention'd carry with them a greater ſemblance of Truth or Probability, and have ſome Antiquity

and

and Authority to recommend them. But This and ſome of thoſe lately mentioned, are invented on purpoſe to be aſſiſtant to a *Bad Cauſe*, which they are willing to ſupport by the Multitude of Argûments, ſeeing they are not able to do it by the Goodneſs and Solidity of them.

V. I will now at laſt offer to you the Interpretation which I conceive is moſt Reaſonable and Accountable, and which I doubt not will gain your Suffrage and Aſſent upon a deliberate conſideration of it. Before I preſent you with This Expoſition, I will make way for it by premiſing Theſe three things.

1. That I intend to adhere to the *Firſt rank of Expoſitors*, who (as you may remember) underſtand the words of *Baptiſm Properly ſo call'd*, i. e. ſome kind of *Real Waſhing*, and particularly of the *Sacramental Baptiſm*, whereby we are Initiated into the Church of Chriſt. For why ſhould we without Neceſſity and Urgent Reaſon (and I can ſee no ſuch thing here) underſtand the words of a *Metaphorical Baptiſm*? It is a General Rule delivered by [i] S^t *Auſtin*, that we ought not to interpret thoſe things Allegorically which are ſpoken Properly,

[i] *De Doctrinâ Chriſtianâ. l. 3. c.* 10.

and that we must never depart from the Literal and Proper sense of Scripture, unless it be manifestly proved that such a sense is not to be followed. The Usual and Proper signification is first to be attended to, and it is not fit we flie to Borrowed and Figurative senses, so long as the Natural and Genuine one will serve our turns. This then I assert, that the Apostle speaks here of the Usual and Received Baptism of the New Testament. But the main thing in the words is the *Præposition*. Therefore

2*ly*, I premise this, that the Præposition ὑπὲρ, which is here translated *for*, is as much as *because of*, or *by reason of*, or *for the sake of*: and consequently ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, is as much as ἕνεκα τῶν νεκρῶν, *mortuorum causâ seu gratiâ, because of the dead*, or *for the sake of the dead*: for 'tis well known that ὑπὲρ τινος is *in gratiam alicujus*. This is the Plain and Ordinary import of That Præposition, and it is Usual and Obvious in Writers of all sorts, so that it is a Wonder it hath been overlook'd here. *Socinus*, to promote his beloved doctrine, maintains that by no means an *Impulsive* but a *Final Cause* is denoted in the New Testament always by This Particle ὑπὲρ, but *Grotius* hath largely

largely ſhew'd this to be notoriouſly falſe, and thereby convinced the Learned how faulty the *Grammar*, as well as the *Divinity* of that Heretick is. I doubt not therefore that the Præpoſition ſignifies here an *Impulſive Cauſe*, and is taken in the ſame ſenſe that it is in thoſe places where it is ſaid, *the Gentiles ſhould glorifie God* for *his mercy*, Rom. 15. 9. i. e. *becauſe of* his mercy ſhew'd unto them: and where the Apoſtle ſaith, *I ceaſe not to give thanks* for *you*. Eph. 1. 16. i. e. *becauſe of* you, of whom I have heard ſo great and laudable things: this excites me to thank God: and where you read of *ſuffering for Chriſts ſake*, and *for the kingdom of God*, Phil. 1. 29. 2 Theſſ. 1. 5. But moſt palpable is That of the Apoſtle, in 2 *Cor.* 12. 10. where he ſaith, he *takes pleaſure in his perſecutions and diſtreſſes*, ὑπὲρ Χριςοῦ, *for Chriſts ſake*, as we rightly render it, and ſo the Præpoſition ought to be rendred in the Text. I might obſerve that this Præpoſitive particle in the Greek, anſwers exactly to the Hebrew ל in many places of the [k] Old Teſtament, which ſignifies *for the ſake*, or *becauſe of*. So then This Verſion of the words is Plain and Eaſie, and hath the Greateſt Authority to vouch it,

[k] Pſal. 44. 22. *For thy ſake we are killed*, &c. (which the Apoſtle renders by ἕνεκα, *Rom.* 8. 36.) *Gen.* 37. 8. & 43. 18. & 2 *Sam.* 1. 26. and in many other places. The Præpoſitions *gnale*, *magnan*, *lemagnan* are uſed after the ſame manner, and are accordingly tranſlated either χάριν or ἕνεκα by the 70.

it, *What ſhall they do that are baptized by reaſon of the dead*, or *for their ſakes?* (How This is to be applied I will ſhew you anon.) Having thus laid down what I underſtand by the Verb βαπτίζεσθαι, and the Præpoſition ὑπὲρ (in which the Main difficulty of the Text lies,) I muſt alſo Premiſe and Obſerve this to you,

3ly, That it is not barely ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν, without an *Article* (as the Learned *Scaliger* alſo noteth on the place, and ſaith it is not without ſome ſingular Emphaſis.) The *Præpoſitive Article* ο is frequently of the like force with the *Hebrew* ה, and the Engliſh *that*, which are notes of Emphaſis and Specification. It is probable therefore that not All but *Some Certain dead* are here meant, for this *Article*, which is here *Demonſtrative*, denotes ſomething that is *Certain and Definitive*. It is true, it is ſometimes left out, and other times inſerted, and yet the ſenſe is neither heightned nor impaired, and I deny not that it is ſo in ſome places in This Chapter. But ſince it is oftentimes Significant and Emphatical, and becomes a Relative and Demonſtrative Pronoun, it may be ſo in This Text that is before us, eſpecially the Article being expreſſed

twice,

twice, and it being likely (as I will make it appear) that it *particularly* relates to ſomething mention'd before in this Chapter. So that the words are to run thus, *What ſhall they do that are baptized by reaſon of, or for the ſake of thoſe dead*, viz. *thoſe dead* before ſpoken of? And now that you may underſtand *Who thoſe dead* are, and that we may the better apprehend the Whole Arguing of the Apoſtle in the Text, and at the ſame time give the Confirmation of the Senſe which I am to offer, I will preſent you with a ſhort view of the *Context*. This is the beſt way certainly to enervate and deſtroy the former Opinions, and to eſtabliſh a right Judgement of the Text, By ſetting before you the Scope of the words, and their Coherence with and Relation to the foregoing parts of the Chapter, I deſpair not of leading you to the True Meaning of the words.

The Scope and Deſign of St *Paul* in this Chapter is to eſtabliſh the Doctrine of *Our Reſurrection*, That ſo Weighty and Important Doctrine, to which he gives the Name of *The Goſpel*, v. 1. This Great Article of the Chriſtian faith (which ſome of the *Corinthians* had called into queſtion) is here maintain'd by

several Arguments; the first whereof is *Christs Resurrection*, which he tells us was attested by above five hundred witnesses, some of whom he saith *are fallen asleep*, v. 6. The same, you know, is expresly said of St *Stephen* by the Evangelist St *Luke*: and without doubt our Apostle speaks here of St *Stephen*, who was stoned to death, (*Acts* 7. 60.) and of St *James* the first Martyr of all the Apostles, who was beheaded by *Herod Agrippa*, *Acts* 12. 2. And [1]*Clemens* tells us that *another* died at the very same time: he relates how the person that carried St *James* to the Place of Judgement, and heard him there so fully give testimony to Christ, was thereby Converted, and presently professed himself to be a Christian: whereupon both of them were carried together to Execution, and were (as he reports) beheaded. The Apostle may be thought likewise to speak here of the *Other James*, who was also called *James the Just*; who was barbarously knock'd on the head by the Jews in *Nero*'s time, as *Eusebius* reports. But whether This *James* was put to death before St *Paul* writ This Epistle to the *Corinthians*, I will not confidently determine. We might also here reckon

[1] Ὑποτυπώσεων l. 7.

reckon *Philip* the Apoſtle, who was put to death at the ſame time that *James the Juſt* was, as ſome relate: whence it is that Our Church celebrates the memory of them both on the ſame day. But it is unqueſtionable that *John the Baptiſt*, who was the Firſt Martyr, *fell aſleep* before all Theſe, being beheaded by a former *Herod*, in the firſt year of our Saviours Preaching. And there were *Many Others* who were crowned with Martyrdom, as our Apoſtle himſelf teſtifieth, *Acts* 26. 10. *Many of the Saints did I ſhut up in priſon; and when they were put to death, I gave my voice againſt them.* There were *Many* that *ſuffered Martyrdom*, who are therefore ſaid to be *fallen aſleep in Chriſt*, v. 18th of this Chapter. Still he mentions thoſe that *are fallen aſleep, viz.* thoſe holy men that Sacrificed their lives for the Goſpel: thoſe are *the dead* whom the Text ſpeaks of. And hence he frames a Second Argument to prove the Abſurdity which would follow upon denying the *Reſurrection*, *Then they alſo which are fallen aſleep in Chriſt are periſhed.* To *Theſe very Saints* who are thus *fallen aſleep*, who are the ſame with thoſe mentioned, in 1 *Theſſ.* 4. 14. *them which*

ſleep in Jeſus, and in v. 16. *the dead in Chriſt*, (the bleſſed Martyrs who died for Chriſts ſake,) to *Theſe* my Text hath relation. Theſe were οἱ νεκροὶ, *thoſe dead for whoſe ſakes*, and *becauſe of whom* ſo many in the Apoſtle's days became Converts, and were *Baptized*. Theſe Martyrs, ſaith he, who *are fallen aſleep in Chriſt are periſhed* if there be no *Reſurrection*: they have utterly Undone themſelves and others by loſing their lives for Chriſt. Thirdly, he proceeds to Argue thus, as thoſe Martyrs were arrant Fools, and Periſhed like ſuch, if there be no *Reſurrection*, ſo *We* that ſurvive are the Wretchedeſt creatures upon earth if that be true: *If in this life only we have hope in Chriſt, we are of all men moſt miſerable*, v. 19. *But now is Chriſt riſen from the dead, and become the firſt-fruits of them that ſlept*, ſaith the Apoſtle triumphantly in the next verſe. By this confident Aſſumption he baffles the Gainſayers, and comforts the Chriſtian Church. But within two verſes after he breaks off this Argument which he had newly reſumed, and after a Digreſſion about the Manner of the future Reſurrection, and the final Conſummation of the world (which reaches

from

from the 23. v. to the words of my Text) he falls into a Fresh Argument thus, *Else what shall they do that are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they also baptized for the dead?* The first word (as we have it translated) *Else*, implies that this verse refers to the immediately foregoing ones, or to some General Conclusion before. But if you examine both, you will not find any Connection between This and the immediately preceding verses: and indeed the *Syriack* leaves out this *Alioquin* or *Else*, as if the Sentence were entire without it. I conceive then that the Greek word is not rightly translated here, but that it ought to be rendred [*Moreover*,] ἐπεὶ signifying sometimes so in the *Septuagints Version*, as in [m] *Psalm.* 78. 20. and in *Prophane Authors*, as in [n] *Herodotus*, and [o] *Plutarch*, especially in this latter, out of whom many places might be produced, wherein ἐπεὶ is as much as ἔπειτα *deinde*, *præterea*; and That is the import of the word in the Text. So then the Apostle returns here to his discourse about the *Resurrection*, and tenders another Argument, a New Reason to confirm it. Moreover (saith he,) to evince further the doctrine of the *Resurrection* which

[m] Ἐπεὶ ἐπάταξε πέτραν, &c.

[n] Ἐπεὶ ὦν τοὺς νεανίας ἀποπεμπομένους ἰέναι τὰ πρῶτα μὲν διὰ τῆς οἰκεομένης. *lib.* 2.

[o] Ἐπεὶ δὲ Ταρκύνιον μισῶν ὁ δῆμος ἀρχὴν ἀποστάσεως ἔλαβε τὸ Λυκρετίας πάθος. *in Publicolâ.*

which I have been discoursing of; what shall they do that are baptized for the sake of the dead Saints and Martyrs whom I spoke of before, who I told you were *fallen asleep*, if the dead rise not at all, if they awake not at the last day? why are they also, or (as *Grotius* noteth, ὑπὲρ in this place is as much as διὰ τοῦτο, *ergo*,) why are they *therefore* baptized *upon the account*, or *for the sake* of *those dead*? why do New Converts come in every day, requesting to be admitted into the Church by Holy Baptism? Is it not, think you, *for the sake* of those excellent persons who *fell asleep in Christ*? Is it not *by reason of them* that they take up the profession of Christianity? Yes surely; they have seen the Lives and Miracles of those Good men, they have observed their Carriage and Constancy at their deaths, and by this they are stirr'd up effectually to own the same Cause, to love the same Religion, and to admit themselves into it by the Sacrament of Baptism. *Those dead* Saints and Martyrs (whose Memories and Acts are still living) fetch in these Great Numbers of Converts. The Bloud of dying Saints is the seed of the Church, which the more plentifully it is sown and shed, yielding

deth the Larger Increaſe of Converts. Hence, hence it is that Proſelytes come in apace to Chriſtianity, that Converts flock to the Holy waters of Baptiſm, for they well obſerving the Admirable Behaviour of thoſe perſecuted Chriſtians at their Death, are ſoon perſwaded into the belief of another Life. From their Examples they are excited to a Love of the Chriſtian Religion, which they ſee makes men live and die couragiouſly, and hereupon they are zealous to be *made members* of the Chriſtian Church by the Sacrament of *Baptiſm*. This is to be *baptized for* or *becauſe of the dead*. Or, after this manner, and in theſe words you may imagine the Apoſtle to argue in my Text: You ſee, O *Corinthians*, that the Sufferings which the Chriſtians undergo, are ſo far from diſcouraging others from turning Chriſtians, that vaſt numbers of Unbelievers are animated thereby to own the Chriſtian Profeſſion, and to live and die in the acknowledgement of it. See what power and efficacy the Example of thoſe Saints hath, and how it works on the hearts of the moſt Reſolved, and makes them preſently renounce and forſake their follies. Tell me, what makes the Idolatrous *Gentile* quit his former prophane life?

life? or what makes the Willful *Jew* renounce his Circumciſion, and leave his Moſaical Waſhings for the Laver of Chriſtian Baptiſm? Is it not to be imputed to This cauſe chiefly, *viz.* that they behold and are raviſhed with the ſingular behaviour of the Suffering Saints, who contentedly quit all for Chriſt their Maſter? They cannot but reverence and imbrace That Religion which inſpires thoſe men with ſuch Valour, and gives them ſo Invincible a Courage: and immediately hereupon they haſten to be Initiated into the Society of ſuch brave Chriſtians. Now, tell me, O ye men of *Corinth*, you eſpecially that queſtion the Article of the *Reſurrection*, is it nothing that ſo many every day voluntarily admit themſelves into the Church by Holy Baptiſm, and that *upon the account of the Deceaſed* Confeſſors and Martyrs, who they ſee ſacrifice all that is dear to them to purchaſe another world? Why ſhould you think there is no Other Life, when you ſee men lay down their Lives for their Religion, and others preſently taking up that Religion for which they loſt their lives? And *for what reaſon* do ſo Great Sholes of Converts come into the Baptiſmal Waters? *What ſhall they*

do

do that are thus baptized? to what end and deſign do they this, and continue to do ſo? To *what purpoſe, on what account* is it? You cannot but ſee that it is *for the ſake* of the Saints whoſe exemplary Lives and Deaths they have beheld, and thereby were throughly convinced of the Truth of Chriſtianity, which promiſes a better life after this at the Reſurrection of the dead. Why are ſo many, I ſay, ſtirred up to embrace Chriſtianity, and to enter into Holy Baptiſm? Is it not *by reaſon of* the Deceaſed Saints and Martyrs? Is it not *becauſe of* the Love and Reſpect they bear Them, and the Goodneſs of the Cauſe which they ſo bravely maintain? Is it not hence that they run to their Spiritual Guides and Inſtructers, and beg to be Baptized: and if theſe demand the Reaſon of it, is not This their Reply, we come to be *Baptized for the dead*, i. e. we are moved to come to the Holy Baptiſm *by reaſon of thoſe Departed Saints*, whoſe Godly behaviour we ſo much admired, whoſe Patience and Courage to the laſt we were even aſtoniſhed at: *becauſe of* Theſe Worthy Perſons we are excited to enter into the Baptiſmal Vow, and to admit ourſelves into their Religion, which is the beſt in the

the world. ¶ What Interpretation can be Plainer and Clearer then this? And yet I know not any Writer excepting One, or P Two at the moſt, who ſeem ſo much as to approach towards This Expoſition, or to give the leaſt hint of this Notion which I have preſented to you. Yet certainly, if you weigh This well, you will find it worthy of all acceptation: for in all the forenumed Interpretations there is either ſomething Defective or Redundant: there is ſome fault in *Grammar* and *Criticiſm*, or a Miſtake in *Hiſtory* and *Chronology*, or an apparent *Inconſequence* in the way of Argument. In ſumm, there were Bold Suppoſitions, but Slender Proofs. Whereas you may obſerve that in This Interpretation which I have tendred to you, the Propriety of the words is preſerved entire: the Criticiſm is not ſtrained: the Genuine and Proper ſignification of the words is upheld: the whole Deſign of the Context and of the Apoſtle's Arguing is diſcover'd: and the Hiſtory of the Antient Church, and the Relation of the beſt Antiquity concurr to make This Expoſition Solid and Authentick. Here is nothing begg'd, but all is free and unconſtrain'd. This is the cleareſt and moſt reaſo-

P Cloppenburg. *Syntagm. Select. Diſput.* 14. Spanhemius *in locum.*

reasonable Sense in it self, and likewise the most accommodate to the Present Purpose of the Apostle in this Chapter, to the Stile and Phraseology of the Scripture, and to the whole Analogy of Christian Faith.

And now in the close of all, to Apply this Interpretation to Ourselves. We have the same reason now to maintain the Christian Religion that those first good Converts had to embrace it. The Consideration which made them enter into Religion, should make us hold it fast. For we as well as they profess that Religion which was attested by the Death, and sealed with the Bloud of Martyrs. Martyrdom made Christians then; let it confirm us in Christianity now. Especially let us be encouraged to love and maintain our Religion, which we can hold with Ease and all the Conveniencies of this life. We are not forced to quit our Lives that we may secure our Religion and our Consciences. Blessed be God, we can enjoy these here, and carry them with us into another World afterwards. But if ever the Divine Providence shall call us to lay down our Lives, and spend our Bloud in the service of our Lord and Saviour, let us *not count our Lives dear unto us*, so that

we

we may finish our course with joy, and testifie the Gospel of the grace of God, as our [q] Apostle speaketh. Let us, like the Primitive Saints, [r] *rejoyce that we are counted worthy to suffer shame,* and even Death *for the Name of Christ.* Let us chearfully sacrifice our Lives for the sake of him who Died for us, let us drown our Affections to the world in our own Bloud, thereby propagating our Holy Religion, and therein following the Pattern of the Blessed Apostles and Primitive Saints, who manfully and undauntedly died for the faith: *on whose account,* and *by virtue of whose Example* it was that Thousands of Converted persons flock'd to the Waters of Baptism, and were ambitious to Assert that Cause for which they saw those Excellent Christians lay down their Lives. The Death of an Eminent Saint made a great number of Disciples in those days: the Bloud of a Holy Martyr baptized whole Cities. This I conceive was to be *baptized for the dead.* This I offer as the most Plain and Easie, the most Natural and Genuine Meaning of the Text.

[q] Acts 20. 24.
[r] Acts 5. 41.

The

The fourth TEXT Enquired into, *viz.*

1 St Peter III. 19, 20.

By which alſo he went and preached unto the Spirits in priſon: which ſometime were diſobedient, &c.

THIS is another Difficult Text of Scripture, and in order to the Clearing of it, I will give you a brief account of the Chapter. It begins with the Peculiar and Proper Duties of Man and Wife, which take up the firſt 7 verſes: but the reſt of the Chapter treats of the Common Vertues and Graces which are required in all Chriſtians, as Meekneſs, Patience, Mercifulneſs, and all the obliging and indearing offices of Love. The Apoſtle chiefly exhorts to *Patience*, that is, to ſuffer with ſubmiſſion and chearfulneſs what ever ſhould be inflicted on them. And here he ſhews particularly how they ought to behave themſelves

ſelves towards their *Perſecutors*. They muſt not be Revengeful, and *render evil for evil*, v. 9. and he ſubjoyns the Reaſons of it in the following verſes. Again, They muſt *not be afraid, neither be troubled*, v. 14. They muſt take courage maugre all their diſtreſſes, and ſtrive to baniſh all Fear and Cowardice, all Diſorder and Perplexity of mind. Moreover, they are obliged to *ſanctifie the Lord God in their hearts, and to be ready to give an anſwer to every one that asketh them a reaſon of the hope which is in them*, and that *with meekneſs and fear*, v. 15. The meaning is that they were not to diſguiſe their perſwaſion, but to make open profeſſion of their Religion even before their Perſecutors. Further, the Apoſtle tells them that they muſt not only profeſs Chriſtianity, but lead Holy Lives, that thereby they may *ſhame* their Adverſaries who *falſly accuſe* them *as evil doers*, v. 16. Laſtly therefore he bids them be ſure that they look to their Lives and Converſations, that *they ſuffer for well-doing, not for evil-doing*, v. 17. And that they may not be unwilling to ſuffer thus, here is ſet before them the Example of *Chriſt* who ſuffered for them, *For Chriſt alſo hath once*

ſuffer'd

ſuffer'd for ſins, the juſt for the unjuſt, v. 18. This highly commends the Sufferings of the *Bleſſed Jeſus* that he was himſelf an Innocent perſon, and that he ſuffer'd for thoſe that were Guilty: whereas no Chriſtians that ſuffer can altogether plead Innocency, they all in ſome meaſure deſerve what they ſuffer. And now the Apoſtle takes occaſion to expatiate on *Chriſts ſuffering*, and the Happy effects of it, to the end of this Chapter, and in part of the next. He ſhews the Deſign of our Saviours Paſſion, *viz. that he might bring us to God*, v. 18. that he might make us Holy and Righteous, and indue us with the Divine and Godlike nature, and that he might at laſt lead us to Heaven and Eternal Glory. And this He was effectually enabled to do, becauſe, though he ſuffer'd death, yet he ſoon roſe from the dead, as you read in that 18. v. *Being put to death in the fleſh, but quickned by the Spirit*. To paſs by the Notion of thoſe men who think they find ſome ground here for their *Æthereal* or *Spiritual Vehicles*, underſtanding the words thus, Put to death in his Terreſtrial body, but quickned or enliven'd with a Spiritual one, for Chriſts ſoul and the ſouls of all the

Saints after death (ſay they) are clothed with Subtile and Ætherial bodies. To let this paſs, the Plain Meaning of the place is this (and it is confirmed by ſeveral of the [a] Fathers) that this *Jeſus* though he ſuffer'd and was *put to death* for us *in the fleſh*, as a Man, as he had a Humane Body, yet he was *quickned by the Spirit*, that is, he roſe from the dead by the vertue and power of the Holy Spirit, who was ever with him. Or thus, he was *put to death in the fleſh*, i. e. crucified in his Humane Nature, but he was *quickned in the ſpirit*, i. e. he was raiſed from the Dead by his Divine Nature. A Parallel place is that in 2 *Cor.* 13. 4. *Though he was crucified through weakneſs*, (his body being but Weak and Frail, and ſubject to death, as all Humane bodies are) *yet he liveth by the power of God*, he reaſſumed his ſoul, and lived again, and ſtill liveth by vertue of his Divine Power. He died as Man, but reſtored himſelf to life as he was God. It was by Chriſts Divine Spirit that his ſeparated ſoul and body were reunited: which you find thus aſſerted by S[t] *Paul*, Rom. 1. 4. *He was declared to be the ſon of God with power, according to the Spirit of holineſs, by the reſurrection from the*

[a] *Athanaſius, Auguſtin, Oecumenius.*

the dead. The humane ſpirit of Chriſt was joyned again to his body by his Eternal Spirit. By Chriſts Divinity his Humanity was raiſed up, and reſtored. And now our Apoſtle inlarges here further upon this Quickning Power of Chriſts *Spirit* or Divinity, in theſe words, *By which alſo he went and preached unto the ſpirits in priſon: which ſometime were diſobedient* &c. The Greek which is here tranſlated [*By which,*] is rendred by others [*wherefore:*] ἐν ᾧ is as much as ἐφ' ᾧ, *ideò,* ſaith *Oecumenius,* and ſo tis thought that theſe words bring in the *Reaſon* of what was ſaid before. But there are few that follow this Interpretation. Our own Tranſlation is more Plain, and more Probable, for thoſe that are acquainted with the ſtile of the New Teſtament know that [*By*] is the frequent ſignification of the Præpoſition [ἐν:] and it is moſt obvious and rational to refer the Article [ᾧ] to the word which immediately preceded it, and that is *the Spirit,* nor have we any reaſon to think that it relates to any thing elſe. *By this Spirit* Chriſt did great and wonderful things after he was riſen from the dead: by this *he went and preached.* But *to whom? To the ſpirits in priſon:* and

moreover it is added, that these *spirits were sometimes disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah*, &c. This is differently understood by Expositors, for 1. some apply it to those who were Alive before and at the time of the Floud. 2. Others understand it of the Souls of the dead. And what dead these are you shall hear when I come to inlarge on this head. 3. Others apply it to the Preaching of the Gospel in the Apostles times.

I. It is applied to *those who were alive before or at the Floud.* And here there are These two Opinions; first, *Arias Montanus* is singular and by himself, who holds that the *spirits in prison* were those that were shut up, and as it were Imprisoned in *Noahs Ark. Those eight souls*, as they are called in the 20th verse, are these *Prisoners*: they were kept by God in the Ark, as in Safe Custody. But this Notion was started merely because there is mention here of *Noahs Ark*; and the *eight souls saved* by it. This without doubt gave the rise to this wild fancy. And besides, there are several things which may hinder us from entertaining it, for 1. it is said, they *were sometime disobedient*, which we cannot apply

apply to any of these *eight*. It is true we read that *afterwards Cham* proved a Wicked person, and was justly Cursed for being so, but this hath no reference to what was *before*. 2. The *Preaching to the Spirits in prison* here spoken of was *whilst the Ark was preparing*, but they were not Imprison'd in the Ark till it was made and finished: therefore this passage cannot be understood of the persons shut up in the Ark. 3. It appears from the Context, that this Preaching of Christ was after his Resurrection, and consequently can't be meant of any Preaching to those in the Ark. Secondly, Others understand it of those sinners of the Old World who lived all the while the Ark was building, which was a hundred and twenty years. *The long-suffering of God waited* thus long on these *Antediluvian sinners*, who are called the *world of the ungodly*, 2 Pet. 2. 5. These are *the Spirits in prison*, say the Learned *Grotius* and Dr *Hammond*. And [b] St *Austin* long before had this notion, and the Venerable *Bede* and *Aquinas*, and others, borrowed it from him. It is true Christ may be said to *preach to these by the Spirit*, that is, the Holy Spirit strove with these sinners whilst *Noah*

[b] *Epist. 99. ad Evod.*

preached to them. This is plainly intimated in *Gen. 6. 3. My Spirit ſhall not allways ſtrive with man.* The Spirit then did ſtrive with the men of that Age, though at laſt the Allmighty declareth that he will put a period to his Spirits ſolliciting and ſtriving with them. But the forenamed *Expoſitors* underſtand theſe words not of the *Spirit of God*, but of the *ſpirit of man* put into him by God. And accordingly they think that this phraſe of the *ſpirits in priſon* alludes to thoſe very words. Becauſe St *Peter* was about uſing a Similitude borrowed from *Noahs* time, he makes uſe, ſaith *Grotius*, of the very words of that Hiſtory. But then you muſt note that he reads not the words as we do, i. e. *my Spirit ſhall not ſtrive with man*, but according to the [c] Septuagint and [d] Vulgar Latin, *My Spirit ſhall not abide, or reſt with man, or thoſe men.* And becauſe the Hebrew word [*Jadon*] comes from [e] another that ſignifies a *Sheath* or *Scabbard*, therefore he renders that place thus, according to *Xantes Pagninus*, (who herein follows R. *Kimchi*) [f] *My ſpirit ſhall not be detain'd in man as in a Scabbard.* And then the meaning of the words is, that the ſpirit or ſoul which

[c] οὐ μὴ καταμείνῃ.
[d] *Non permanebit.*
[e] *Nadan, vagina.*
[f] *Non erit ut in vaginâ ſpiritus meus cum homine.*

I

I gave and put into man ſhall not be uſeleſs, and produce no effect, as a Sword in a Scabbard, which doth nothing of that it was made for. A Scabbard is as it were a *Priſon* to the Sword, and the Body is as 'twere a *Sheath* or *Priſon* to the Soul. So the Souls of the *Antediluvian* ſinners were immerſed in their Bodies, Impriſoned, and Uſeleſs to any good purpoſes. Or thus, my Spirit ſhall not abide as a ſword in a ſheath, it ſhall no longer be ſheathed in man, it ſhall not be Impriſoned and confined in him, *i. e.* I will deſtroy him, he ſhall not live any longer, for ſo it follows, *v.* 7, 13. This is *Grotius*'s Notion, and he is of opinion that [*the ſpirits in priſon*] refer to this. And among the Fathers, St *Jerom* favours this Interpretation. This Criticiſm is further confirmed (ſome think) by obſerving that the Chaldee word נדנא which ſignifies a *ſheath*, ſignifies alſo a *body*, as is evident from *Dan.* 7. 15. And hence perhaps that Rabbinical ſaying, [a] *All bodies are Sheaths: bleſſed is that which deſerves to be the Sheath of the Law.* From all theſe things put together ſome infer that the Apoſtle here alludes to this Notion, and that *the ſpirits in priſon* are *Souls ſheathed*, ſhut up, impri-

[a] *Omnia corpora vaginæ ſunt: beatum illud quod meretur ut ſit vagina Legis.* Talm. Sanedr.

imprisoned in their bodies. Christ came and *preached* to these souls, *viz.* the sinners that lived in *Noahs* days, and he preached unto them by the Preaching of *Noah*.

But this Interpretation is by no means to be admitted, for 1. This quaint notion of the *Sheath* and the *Body* is a plain force upon that Text in Gen. 6. 3. which is truly and uncorruptly rendred according to the Hebrew, [My Spirit shall not strive,] that is, I will no longer concern my self with these men, I will give them up to their own lusts and lewd desires, my Spirit shall not strive, as formerly, with them, they shall not be convinced by *Noahs* Preaching, nor wrought upon by the foresight of those Judgments which they cannot but see hang over their heads: and when I have thus given them up to their own vile imaginations, I will cut them off in their sins, and bereave them of all hopes of mercy for the future. This is the True import of those words, and consequently all that the foresaid Criticks suggest is nothing to the Text, but is a mere Distorting and Perverting of it. 2. Suppose this place of Scripture might be rendred as they have done it, yet who sees not that it is far from their purpose?

What

What likeneſs is there between a ſheath and a Priſon? It muſt be ſtrong fancy that perſwades a man to think that the latter is put here for the former, and conſequently that the words I am now treating of have reference to thoſe in *Geneſis*. Or, 3^ly, ſuppoſe it were ſo, yet all we learn from this ſtrange expreſſion is, that the ſinners before the Floud *had ſouls in their bodies*, for that is the Engliſh, it ſeems, of the *ſpirits in priſon*, it is no more then ſouls in bodies. 4. This phraſe might be made uſe of with more reaſon to prove the *Platonick Praexiſtence*, and the Detruſion of ſouls into bodies, which they ſo much talk of. I wonder the *Platoniſts* never took notice of this Text. Their Hypotheſis cannot be expreſſed more fully then tis here. If I were one that favour'd the Doctrine of *Praexiſtence*, I ſhould prize this place exceedingly: there is none like it. For the *ſpirits in priſon* are the ſouls which are thruſt into theſe Bodies as into Priſons. For the Body of man (as they are wont to ſpeak) is but *Ergaſtulum animæ*, the Priſon or Dungeon of the Soul: here it is incloſed or impriſon'd as a Sword in a Sheath. And theſe Spirits which are thus immerſed into

into Humane Bodies *were ſometime diſobedient*, i. e. they ſinn'd in the ſtate of *Præexiſtence*, and therefore are ſent into theſe bodies, and there Impriſoned. Thus this place may be alledg'd in favour of that Hypotheſis; but any man who duly weighs the ſcope of the words may ſee that they intend no ſuch thing as this. The Defenders of that opinion might as well make uſe of that place, *Pſal.* 142. 7. *Bring my ſoul out of priſon*, and thence prove that humane ſouls are thruſt into the priſons of theſe bodies, and that Theſe are *the ſpirits in priſon* meant by our Apoſtle. But 5^ly, that which unanſwerably confounds This Opinion (*viz.* that the words are to be underſtood of the *Sinners before the Floud*, and of Chriſts preaching to *them* by his Spirit) is this, that the Text ſpeaks not of ſomething done by Chriſt *before* his Reſurrection, as his Deſcent into hell, when he was dead: but it ſpeaks of ſomething which Chriſt did *after* his Suffering and Reſurrection, when he was indued with an extraordinary power; therefore it cannot be thus meant. This is plain from the Context and the Words themſelves, and therefore nothing can more powerfully overthrow this

this Aſſertion then This doth: this ruines that Opinion without remedy. Beſides, it is ſaid here of thoſe *ſpirits*, that they were *ſometime diſobedient*, as much as to ſay, they were not ſo *then* when Chriſt preached to them. But becauſe this is not a Neceſſary Conſequence, I will not urge it: for they might be *diſobedient before* and *then* too, as I willingly grant, and ſhall have occaſion to ſay more of it afterwards.

Therefore *Others* (ſeeing the Levity of this Opinion) though they hold that by *the ſpirits in priſon* are meant the ſinners that lived before the General Deluge in *Noahs* days, yet they underſtand their *being in priſon* in another ſenſe: as thus, Chriſt by his Spirit in *Noah*, who is call'd a [h] *Preacher of righteouſneſs*, did once preach to that generation of men who lived before the Floud, whoſe *ſpirits are now in priſon*, i. e. in Hell for their former diſobedience. Theſe ſpirits were impriſoned in Hell at the time when St *Peter* wrote this Epiſtle, but they were not in that Priſon when Chriſt preached to them by the Spirit. The ſhort is, Chriſt preached to theſe men in the days of *Noah*, who were in this infernal Priſon in the days of the Apoſtles,

[h] 2 Pet. 2. 5.

Apoſtles, and have been ever ſince. S. *Peter* ſpeaks of the ſpirits *now in priſon*, or *then in priſon* when he wrote, not of the ſpirits in priſon when Chriſt preached to them. This Interpretation is approved of by many, but it is very Harſh and much Forced. For if you underſtand the words fairly and without ſtraining them, they muſt neceſſarily ſignifie ſomething which Chriſt *did to the ſpirits in priſon*. Now to ſay, *they were not in priſon* when he *did it to them in priſon*, is Abſurd and Ridiculous: at leaſt, it is Wreſting the words, and not taking them in their Genuine ſenſe which they appear to us in. And why we ſhould abandon the Genuine and Plain ſenſe for a Forced and Far-Fetched one I can ſee no reaſon at all: therefore this ſenſe muſt not have our Approbation, though it be ſo generally received.

II. Others apply it to the *Souls of the Dead*. And here there is a great Difference both among thoſe of the Popiſh and Proteſtant perſwaſion. 1. Some will have theſe *ſpirits in priſon* to be the Souls of thoſe Deceaſed ſinners who lived before the Flood, and periſhed in it, and were ſent to Purgatory. 2. The Souls of all the Saints and Righteous men who had

had been from the beginning of the world till Christ, are deem'd by others to be these *Spirits in prison*; and this *Prison* is *Limbus Patrum*. 3. Some interpret it of the Damned Souls in Hell. Nay 4ly, the *Spirits in prison* are the souls of the Blessed in Heaven, saith another.

First, *Estius* and some other Roman Catholicks understand this Text of *Purgatory*. This is the *Prison* wherein the souls of the Antediluvian sinners were kept, for these persons were Unbelievers and Impenitent all the time before the Floud came, but then they believed and repented. S. *Jerom*, *Austin* and *Hilary* lean this way, interpreting the words to This purpose, that Christ went to deliver those poor souls who, when *Noah* preached to them, and God patiently expected their repentance a hundred years, remain'd Incredulous and Disobedient, but afterwards, when they saw the Floud coming upon them, became very Penitent, and hated their former evil ways. To these Christ, being Dead, *went and preached*. So then in short, the *Prison of Purgatory* is meant here by the Apostle, and Christ went personally down thither, and preached to the people of that place. But I answer 1. They must evidently

prove

prove that there is such a Place and State as *Purgatory*, otherwise we have no ground to believe that This Text is meant of it. For this being but an Obscure place of Scripture (as all grant) we cannot lay any stress on it. And though some of the Fathers seem to understand it of *Purgatory*, yet it is to be remembred that the *Mystery of Iniquity* began to *work* long before their time, and it is no wonder that This and other Corrupt Opinions crept into the Church, and that even some of the most Learned and Pious men were misled by them, for they were but Men, and so were liable to Mistake and Error. 2. The Patrons of this Opinion hold that Christ *went personally* to Purgatory, but no such thing is mention'd here; yea, another sort of *Going* is expressly named, for it is said, [*by which*, i. e. by *the Spirit he went*,] which seems to exclude a Local and Personal Going. 3. How inconsistent is this opinion with their doctrine of *Purgatory*? for they hold that those impure souls are sent to be purged in the other world, who had some Punishment yet remaining to undergo, and who were not sufficiently Purged in this world. But this was not the case of the

sinners

ſinners who periſhed in the *Flood*. Never was there ſuch a Puniſhment and Judgment, and never ſhall the like be again. And therefore according to the notion of theſe men, thoſe perſons were ſufficiently Puniſhed, and there was nothing left to undergo. And then, as to their Moral Purgation, if thoſe perſons repented at all, it is reaſonable to think that their Repentance in thoſe unparalleld circumſtances was exceeding Great, and that it proved on all accounts Effectual and Complete. Thoſe *Waters* were able to cleanſe them ſufficiently, ſo that they needed not to be ſent to theſe *Purging Flames*. 4. This is againſt the received opinion of the Torments of *Purgatory*, for they are ſaid to end in a much ſhorter time. The Offenders of the Old World had lain ſhut up in this *Priſon* almoſt three thouſand years, according to theſe mens Interpretation of the Text, and yet it is the generall doctrine of thoſe that aſſert the Pains of *Purgatory*, that they are much ſooner over, and that it was not intended that theſe Torments ſhould be of very long continuance. 5. Why did Chriſt go and take the *Antediluvian* Wretches out of the *Priſon of Purga-*

tory, and none else? For these are only mention'd here, and read of no others any where else. Why did not our Saviour clean that place, and set open the Prison-doors to all, and make a General Jail-Delivery? Or, will these men say that none went to Purgatory but those poor creatures who lived in *Noah's* time? This they will hardly assert. These and several other reasons may induce us to believe that by the *spirits in prison*, are not meant the *souls in Purgatory*.

Secondly, some imagine that *Limbus Patrum* is meant here by St *Peter*. Christ went to this place, say they, and fetched thence all the Souls of the Saints who died before his Coming. Some of the Fathers, as *Athanasius*, *Ambrose*, *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, and others, interpret the Apostle's words thus: and it is their known Assertion that all the souls of the righteous, as soon as they were separated from their bodies, were implisoned in some Low Place under ground, and there were detain'd till our Saviour came and inlarged them. These are the *spirits in prison*. Thus *Bellarmine*[1] interprets these words, telling us that the *spirits in prison* whom Christ preached to

[1] *De Christo l. 4. c. 10, 11.*

were

were Separate Souls ſent to that foreſaid Apartment and Receptacle. And whereas it is ſaid, Chriſt was *quickned in the ſpirit*, he ſaith this is meant of Chriſts Separate Soul: this being *quickned* went ſtrait way to *Limbo*, to viſit the ſeparate ſouls there. But 1. *Bellarmin* talks very wildly on this point, for the Soul being Immortal, can't be ſaid to be *quickned* or *made alive*, and therefore it was unwarily and groundleſſly ſaid by him that Chriſts ſoul was *quickned*. But 2ly, I anſwer to what he and others alledg concerning *Limbus Patrum*, that there never was ſuch a place for the ſeparate ſouls to go to. This, according to thoſe of the Church of *Rome*, is that place where the ſouls of the Patriarchs and Faithfull under the Old Teſtament were lodged. But this is a mere Fiction, for the ſpirits of the deceaſed Saints go preſently to Heaven, and are not detain'd in any *Priſon*, much leſs ſo Long a time, before they reach that place of Bliſs. Therefore we ought not to credit the Romaniſts, when they tell us with great confidence, that Chriſt went and preached to *Abraham* and the reſt of the Patriarchs when he left this world, and that he acquainted them that the work

of Redemption was finiſhed, and that he took them up with him to Heaven. Let them firſt prove that *theye was* ſuch a *Priſon* (for they confeſs it is *now* demoliſhed, and hath been ever ſince Chriſt,) and then we ſhall attend to what they ſay, and not before. 3. This Expoſition is faulty, becauſe it is too Wide for the Text, which refers only to thoſe of *Noahs* days. Now ſuppoſing Chriſt preach'd to them in priſon, how is it gather'd from the Text that Chriſt went and redeem'd All from that place? And on the other ſide, if they aſſert that Chriſt redeem'd only thoſe who were before the Floud, it would be proper to ask how they came to have this Priviledge above the reſt, but it will be hard to give a Reaſon of it. So that one way or other it is Improbable.

Thirdly, there are Others who by the *Spirits in priſon* underſtand the *Damned ſpirits or ſouls in Hell*. Here I will not deny that the word *Priſon* hath reſpect unto the Place of the Damned (as I ſhall ſhew you afterwards:) but that Chriſt went into Hell, and Preached there to the inhabitants of that place, I am not convinc'd how it can be made good from This Text. Though I grant

that

that some of the Antient Fathers make use of this place of Scripture to prove that Christ descended locally and personally into those infernal regions. Particularly St *Augustin* indeavours to prove it from these very words, and concludes at last, [k] who but an Infidel will deny that Christ was in Hell? As for several Other Writers of the Church, they are divided in their Comments on this Text; some think it refers to *Limbus Patrum*, others to *Purgatory*, and a third sort conceive it speaks of *Hell*, that place where the souls of the Wicked and Reprobate are tormented. This is the *Prison* the Apostle here means, say they. But how did Christ *preach* to the spirits there? This *Preaching* is interpreted after a different manner: for some say our Saviour went to Punish and Affright the devils, to Triumph over the damned, and to shew himself a Conqueror over Satan and all the Infernal Powers. But these men grosly abuse St *Peter*'s words when they expound them thus, *i. e.* when they interpret Christs *Preaching to the spirits in prison*, of his Triumphing over the damned in hell, the word [*preaching*] being never in the Sacred Writings understood in such a man-

[k] *Quis ergo nisi infidelis negaverit fuisse apud inferos Christum? Epist.* 99.

ner, but all that are acquainted with the Holy Stile must needs acknowledge that 'tis taken in a far other meaning: therefore this must be look'd upon as a downright perverting of the Apostle's words, only to serve their own ends. Others are not content to say that Christ went to Triumph over the damned, but they talk of something Higher, *viz.* the Relieving, yea the Delivering of the damned out of hell. This, say they, is the *Preaching* here spoken of. This is a Bold Flight, and but few of the [1] Fathers have ventured to soar so High. But who would expect any such thing as this from the Learned Author of the *Mystery of Godliness*? Yet there you will find him giving This Interpretation of the words, *viz.* that *the spirits in prison*, i. e. "*the Disobedient souls in Hell*, "*were redeemed by Christs Preaching*: "*they were a glorious spoil taken out of* "*the hands of the devil*. But it doth "not follow (saith he) there is any Re-"demption out of Hell now, much less "any Purgatory. For there were two "Notable Occasions for This, such as "will never happen again. For it respects "the souls of them that were suddenly "swept away in the Deluge, and the Solem-

[1] Clemens Alexand. *Strom.* 6. Origen. *cont. Celf.* l. 2. With whom may be reckon'd *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, and *Oecumenius*, who seem to favour this opinion.

"Solemnity of our Saviours Crucifixion "and Ascension. He undermined the "Prince of death in the midst of death, "and at his Ascension victoriously carried "away those first-fruits of his suffering "since heaven. At the solemn Corona- "tion of a Great Prince the Prison-doors "are flung open. This is the interpre- tation of Dr *Henry More*. But I am sorry this Worthy person hath given these men an occasion to think well of their doctrine of *Purgatory*, and even Redemption from the pains of the Bot- tomless Pit, those men (I say) whom he doth not use to gratifie at other times, by his too lavish concessions. He hath open'd the door here, and All, as well as those *Antediluvian* sinners, may go forth. If Hell be not a *fixed* place or state, if it be not a *Close-Prison*, then there is hope that Every man at length may be set free from it, and walk at large. And this is that which S. *Augustin* tells us some indeavour'd to prove from This Text, *viz.* that All shall at last be freed from Hell-Torments. But the Doctor declares he intends no such thing, but is perswaded only that the words speak of a Singular and never to be Parallell'd Instance. But in answer

[m] *De hæres. ad Quod vult deum.*

to what he and others before have asserted, I will briefly make it good that the words speak not at all of Christs going down to Hell, or of his Preaching there. For 1. These words referring to the souls of those who lived in *Noahs* time, what was the reason that our Saviour went into Hell to preach to These rather then the rest? how came these despisers of *Noahs* preaching to have this Privledge above all other persons, that Christ should descend to the Infernal Pit to relieve them particularly? Why did not the *Sodomites* and others share in the like kindness? 2. It is here intimated that the words are not meant of Christ's Local Descent into hell, for 'tis said he went *by the spirit*, which signifies another thing, and what that is I have told you. But I have mention'd this before. 3. It can't be spoken of Christs going to Hell, because the words are of something that he did after his Resurrection, as hath been before suggested. The order of the Apostle's words is this, first *Christ was put to death*, then he was *quickned* or rose again, and after that *he went and preached*: therefore it is impossible that this Preaching should be meant of any sort of Preaching to those

in

in Hell, unless you will make Christs Descent into hell follow his Resurrection from the dead, which was never dreamt of yet. Let this therefore be remembred, that the Text speaks of something which our Saviour did after he was risen from the dead, and then it must be acknowledged that this is a plain confutation of the Adversaries Opinion. This will spoil their Interpretation, for when 1 Luk. 12. it is said they were *sometime* disobedient, it is implied (I do not say absolutely inferred) that they are not so *now*.

Fourthly, (and which shews the vast Difference between the Judgements of men on this place) whereas some Protestants and most Papists think *Hell* is meant here, *Calvin* believes the contrary, and vouches *Heaven* to be understood by this word φυλακη, which is not a *Prison* according to him, but a *watch-tower*, and so indeed the word sighifies sometimes. The *spirits* or souls of the faithful were in φυλακη, in *speculâ*, on their *watch-tower*, viz. in Heaven, Thither Christ ascended, and there he found the Saints of the Old World very Intent on the Salvation promised by Christ, they confidently hoped for it and his Coming, and as it were *Look'd for* these as from

some

some *Watch-tower*. But I confess I do not see what reason that Learned Writer had to alter the ordinary Translation of the word φυλακὴ, and to render it here a *Watch-tower*. He might have retain'd the Other Translation, and yet have kept his Interpretation entire. For what better word could there be to express *Heaven* then φυλακὴ, as it signifies a *Custody*, a *Hold*, a *place of Safety*, like [n] ἐπιπέλαγος τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, which some render *Abraham's Port* or *Haven*? Christ being raised from the grave went and preached to the *spirits in safe custody*, i. e. in Heaven: there he declar'd to them what Great things he had done, and how he had finished the work of mans Redemption. As the words before spoke of Christs *Death* and *Resurrection*, so these of his *Ascension*, and *Exaltation*. This is the sense of that Learned Man, and if he had not alter'd the usual version of the word φυλακὴ, it would have done as well. But against his interpretation, I alledge first his Wavering in the solution of this Text, for in his *Institutions* (l. 2. c. 16.) and upon the Place, he expounds it of the souls of the *Faithful*, but in his *Psychopannychia* he tells us, that *Christ went and preach'd*

[n] Luk. 16. 22.

not

not only Remission of sins to the spirits of the Godly, but also Confusion to the spirits of the ungodly: thus he takes in both *Heaven* and *Hell*. Secondly, to what purpose did Christ go and preach to the Saints in heaven, when they could not but know the certainty of their Salvation by Their being in that place? It was needless to preach to them what they knew already. Therefore I can't see how this word can be applied to *Heaven*. But the main thing which hinders my Assent to his Interpretation is This, that the words have relation to *Noahs* days, and the particular people of that time. Now 1. It is probable that the greatest numbers of them perished everlastingly, as the [a] Scripture, when it speaks of the sinners of the Old World, doth more then intimate. These were so far from being placed in a *High Watch-tower*, a place whence they might look for, and espie a Saviour, that they were plunged into the Lowest Abyss of misery and despair. 2. Supposing that people were Saved, and in Heaven, yet wherefore did Christ, when he ascended thither, preach to These rather then others? And why were These separate souls above all the rest continually upon their *Watch*, in hopes

[a] Luke 17. 26. 2 Pet. 2. 5.

hopes of the promised salvation? I do not apprehend any ground for this, and consequently I cannot admit of this Exposition. These are the several Judgments of those *Expositors* who understand the words concerning *the souls of the deceased*. Now I proceed to the Last Classis of Interpreters.

III. Others apply the words to *the Preaching of the Gospel to unbelievers in the Apostles times*, understanding by *the spirits in prison*, the Heathens, and by Christs *Preaching* to them, his Sending his Disciples and Apostles to preach to them. [p] *Episcopius* and [q] *Limborch* are the men who offer this Interpretation, and I take it to be the fairest of all those which have been named. But yet as it is delivered by those persons I cannot wholly subscribe to it: therefore I shall only proceed on the main and general ground which they have laid, and I shall make bold to add several things which I find wholly wanting in those Authors Comments, and thereby give you a perfect resolution of the Text. First then, *the spirits* are the same with *Souls*, and Souls are as much as *Men* or *Persons* with bodies and souls: so in the next verse *eight souls* are said to be saved,

[p] *Institut. l. 4. c. 30.*
[q] *Theolog. Christian. lib. 3. cap. 13.*

ved, i. e. *eight persons* who were in the Ark. This is an usual Synecdoche: as *Body* is put for the whole man often, so *Soul* or *Spirit* signifies the same. [Spirit] is not always (though most commonly) applied to the Souls of the Deceased, as some would perswade us. Living men are call'd *Spirits*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1. 1 *John* 4. 1. 3. *Seducing spirits* are seducers, or persons that seduce. Or, if you will not grant this interpretation in these places, yet you must needs grant that *persons* may be meant by *spirits* as well as by *souls*, which latter you cannot deny, if you consult *Rom.* 13. 1. and several other places, where by *soul* is meant *a person*, i. e. a man consisting of *body* and *soul*, or (which is the same thing) *spirit*. Or, if [Spirits] be meant of the *Souls of Dead men* properly, then also there is reason to apply it here, because they are *Dead in sin*, and they are as it were destined to *Eternal Death*. Those who are *spiritually dead* are rightly call'd *Spirits*. These *spirits*, i. e. these *Men* are no other then the *Gentile Idolaters* (say the above named Expositors,) who lived in the days of Christ and the Apostles. And because it is said they were *sometime disobedient*, *Epiſco-*

pius

pius gives this account of it; He reckons all the Gentiles from *Noah's* time, as one and the same people, (which is a thing not unusual with the Holy Writers;) and so when Christ preach'd to the Gentiles of his time, and the Apostles times, he may be said to preach to the Gentiles of *Noah's* time, who were a part of the whole body of the Gentiles. So that if you ask of him, How could these people that lived in the *Apostles times* be said to be disobedient *in the days of Noah*, his answer is, that the whole race of wicked men is considered here as one Body, and consequently what the first and chief of them did, those that came after them may be said to have done. These wicked Gentiles that lived in the Apostles times are justly said to have been *disobedient in the days of Noah*, because they were a part of the whole, and included in the main Body of sinners. But I question whether this will be look'd upon by the Inquisitive as a Satisfactory Resolution. For my part, I cannot prevail with my self to think it such, and therefore I shall anon offer another Interpretation. Moreover, I must add this, why may we not understand these words [*who were some-*

sometimes disobedient not only of the *Gentiles*, but of the *Jews* also? The Text (as I conceive) speaks both of the Conversion of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, the Gospel being preached, and Salvation offered to both these. I see therefore no reason, why the Exposition should be confined to the only, or to the Pagan *Infidels*, and such as were alien from the Commonwealth of *Israel*, Christ preached to both *Jews* and *Heathens*, who were *heretofore*, or *sometime disobedient*. The former of these, both under the Old and New Testament, are noted to be such, they are complained of as a *disobedient* people. The *forefathers* even of those who did live in the Apostles days were disobedient, and therefore those may be said to be *sometime disobedient*, because they are included in their *forefathers*. Or rather, this may be meant of the *between* Lives and Manners of those individual persons who then lived. And as the *Jews* had lived in Superstition and Ignorance, and gross Rebellion against God, so the *Gentiles* had been brought up in Idolatry, and in most lewd and prophane practises. Christ after his Resurrection and Ascension pitied the miserable condition of both these sorts

of

of vile Sinners. They had been disobedient, but now Christ by his Apostles (whom he sent (forth) to preach the Gospel) effectually reminded them of it, of which more anon. That which we have hitherto suggested, and which was the first thing to be done, is this, that these Heathens and Pagan people who had heretofore been so signally disobedient, are the spirits or persons here spoken of, who are also said to be in prison.

Of the Reasonableness and Consistency of which interpretation I will give you this following account. They are called the *spirits in prison*, because they were shut up in Ignorance, as in a spiritual Prison. They refused the knowledge of God, and wilfully blinded themselves, and so became, like the *Egyptians*, [1] *Prisoners of darkness*, and lay *fetter'd in the bonds of night*. Because they were not only shut up in the Dark Dungeon of wilful Ignorance, but were (as our Church expresseth it) *tied and bound with the chain of their* other grosser *sins*. Whence you read of the *cords* or [2] *chains of sin*, Prov. 5. 22. In this respect very bad men are said to be [3] *in the bond of iniquity*, and to be [4] *taken captive by Satan at his will*. This ex-

[1] Wisd. 17. 2.

[2] σειραὶ. 70.

[3] Acts 8. 23.

[4] 2 Tim. 2. 26.

10

expreſſes the *Miſery* they were in. They were ſpirits *in Priſon*, that is, unſpeakably Diſtreſſed and Wretched. This you will find to be the Stile of Scripture: and accordingly the Pſalmiſt ſaith, *The Lord deſpiſeth not his Priſoners*, i. e. thoſe that are in Diſtreſs and Miſery, *Pſal.* 69. 33. And thus That in *Pſ.* 79. 11. may be underſtood, *Let the ſighing of the Priſoners come before thee.* And again he prays, *Bring my ſoul out of Priſon*, Pſ. 142. 8. *Soul* is to be taken here for *the Perſon*, and *Priſon* (φυλακη is the very word uſed by the Septuagint) for *Calamity* or *Miſery*, and ſo this is the like manner of ſpeech with that in the Text, *The ſpirits, or ſouls in priſon.* We pity thoſe poor wretches who are in Durance, who can only look through the Grates, but are denied the liberty of going abroad to help themſelves; we reckon their condition very ſad and deplorable. But it is certain that theſe poor ſouls who are impriſon'd and Fetter'd by their Sins are in a far worſe caſe, becauſe Sin is the greateſt Bondage. They, like *Samſon*, *grind in the priſon-houſe*, they are put to exceſſive Drudgery and Slavery, which are ſo much the Worſe becauſe they are not Senſible of it. 4. This

ſhews their Inability to relieve themſelves. They are as it were in ſome *Strong* and *Cloſe Priſon*, whence there is no delivery without Gods help, and the ſpecial aſſiſtance of Divine Grace. They are ſhut up in their Dark Cells, and know not how to free themſelves, *they are ſo faſt in priſon that they cannot get forth.* 5ly and laſtly, As I have before ſuggeſted, *Hell* is call'd a *Priſon* in the Stile of Scripture. Thus in *Mat.* 5. 25. to be *caſt into priſon* is to be *caſt into Hell*: and accordingly the *Syriack* Verſion of the word is *Sheol*, which is the word uſed ſometimes for *Hell*. God *caſt the Angels down to hell*, ſaith St *Peter*, and immediately he adds that he *delivered them into Chains of darkneſs*, 2 Pet. 2. 4. and St *Jude* (v. 6.) ſpeaks after the ſame manner. *Hell* implys *Chains*, and that thoſe who are in that place are *Bound in the houſe of their priſon.* So Satan is ſaid to be *bound with a great chain*, Rev. 20. 1, 2. *i. e.* he was Confined to *Hell*; and afterwards, he was *looſed out of that Priſon*, v. 7. Now, Wicked and Ungodly men are deſervedly ſaid to be *in This priſon*, even before they are actually caſt into it, becauſe they are as ſure to be

there, *i. e.* to be Damned as if they were actually so. They are as certainly to be shut up in the *Prison of Hell*, as if they were now in it. In this sense Infidels and Unbelievers are said to be *condemned already*, John 3. 18. All wilful sinners are clapt up in the *Prison*, are consign'd as it were to *Hell*, unless they hearken to the Preaching of the Gospel, and Repent, and be Converted, and so escape the damnation of Hell. From all these particulars you may be satisfied how *Fit* an expression this is, how *Appositely* those *Unbelievers* and *Idolaters* to whom the Gospel was preached are stiled *Spirits in Prison*. I will yet further observe to you, how the Scripture delights in This way of expression. As I have shewd you from thence how Sinners are *Imprisoned persons*, so I have This likewise to take notice of from Scripture, that the Converting of souls by Christs coming and preaching, is expressly set forth to us by *Freeing them from prison*. Which confirms This notion, and the Use of this Phrase, that sinners, whilst they are in their Unregenerate state, whilst they are under the power of their sins are *in prison*: for they cannot be *taken out* thence, unless they

had been *in it.* To this purpoſe we may obſerve the prophet *Iſaiah*'s words, ch. 42. v. 7. where deſcribing the Office of the *Meſſias*, he makes this the ſumm of it, *to bring out the priſoners from the priſon, and them that ſit in darkneſs out of the priſon houſe.* And again, ſpeaking of the bleſſed deſign of the *Meſſias*, he expreſſeth it thus, ch. 49. v. 9. *That thou mayeſt ſay to the priſoners, Go forth.* And further in ch. 61. v. 1. he introduceth the *Meſſias* himſelf declaring with his own mouth, that he was *ſent to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the priſon to them that are bound.* Which (as well as the former paſſages) is meant of the Spiritual Looſing of men from their ſins by the ſaving coming of Chriſt, and preaching of the Goſpel, as is evident from what our Saviour ſaid when he read theſe words of *Iſaiah*, *This day*, ſaith he, *is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears*, Luke 4. 21. As much as if he had ſaid, This is the grand end and purpoſe of my appearing in the world, and of all my undertakings for mankind, namely, *to ſet them at liberty*, to *ſave them from their ſins.* This was long ſince foretold by the prophet *Iſaiah*, and now behold,

hold, it is accompliſhed in me at this time, who ſpeak unto you and preach the Goſpel of Salvation. *I came to ſeek and ſave that which was loſt*, I came to *bleſs you in turning you from your iniquities*, I came to reſcue you from the bondage of ſin and Satan. This is the meaning of *opening the priſon to them that are bound*, of *ſaying to the priſoners, Go forth*, of *bringing the priſoners out of the priſon houſe*. We ſee then that from the *ſtile* of this Evangelical Prophet we are directed to a right underſtanding of St *Peters* words, we are informed that the *ſpirits in priſon* are *men in their ſins*. Jeſus by his Spirit in his Apoſtles *went and preached* to theſe Priſoners, he proclaimed Liberty to theſe poor miſerable Captives.

And theſe are *the dead to whom the Goſpel was preached*, 1 Pet. 4. 6. A place of Scripture which hath mightily puzzled Expoſitors. Dr *Hammond* and others underſtand by *theſe dead* the ſinners of the Old World: for theſe were *dead* (ſay they) when *Peter* wrote this Epiſtle, though they were *alive* when they were preached to. So that place, *Ruth* 1. 8. is interpreted, *The Lord deal kindly with you, as you have dealt with*

the dead, i. e. my ſons and your huſbands who are *now dead*, (when *Naomi* ſpoke this to her daughters in law) but were *alive* when the kindneſs was ſhewd to them. But I have obſerv'd before that this is a Strain'd ſenſe, and therefore where a more Natural one offers it ſelf we ought to accept of it. The moſt Plain and Proper meaning of [*the dead*] here is that they were dead *at that very time* when the Goſpel was preached to them. I underſtand it of *Spiritual death*, which brings *Eternal death* with it without repentance. The widow *that liveth in pleaſure is dead while ſhe liveth*, 1 Tim. 5. 6. It is uſual to call Sinners *dead men*, becauſe (as the ſame Apoſtle ſaith) they are *dead in treſpaſſes and ſins*, Eph. 2. 1. Yea, it were eaſie to ſhew that this way of ſpeaking was not unuſual with the *Gentile Moraliſts*. So *the dead* here to whom the Goſpel was preached were ſuch as were *Spiritually dead*. Otherwiſe you can't make ſenſe of the *Reaſon* or *End* of the Goſpels being preached to them, *viz. that they might be judged according to men in the fleſh, but live according to God in the ſpirit*. *Caſtalio*, after his modeſt way in the like caſes, profeſſes that

he

he knows not what to make of theſe words. Some tell us that they ſpeak of Penitent ſinners involved in a Common Ruine, that though they were *judg'd in the fleſh*, i. e. in reſpect of their Bodies, as far as Men can ſee, yet in their *Spirit* or Soul they reſt, and *live* with God. But it cannot be proved that the Apoſtle here refers to any ſuch Common Calamity, and therefore this Expoſition is not to be admitted. Others alter it a little thus, Theſe words (ſay they) are added to remove the ſcandal laid in the way of Religion by Infidels and Pagans, who (as you read v. 4.) *thought it ſtrange that* the Chriſtians *ran not with them to the ſame exceſs of riot, and ſpake evil of them* on that account. They cenſured, defamed, and even condemned them becauſe they were not like themſelves. But though they were condemned as to their *fleſh*, their outward man, yet their *ſpirits*, their inward man obtain'd favour, and even eternal *life* with God. But how this is brought in as a *Reaſon*, as it is here, [*For, for this cauſe &c.*] no man can diſcover, and therefo e we cannot ſatisfie ourſelves with this interpretation of the place. Others would underſtand it thus, *That they might be judged accor-*

x *Hunc locum non intelligo.*

ding to men in the flesh, i. e. that those who lived carnally and wickedly might be damned, and *live according to God in the spirit*, i. e. that those who lived godlily and righteously might be saved. But this is a manifest perverting of the words, turning the [*but*] into [*and*,] and making this place speak of two sorts of persons, when it is most apparent that it speaks but of one. But now according to the Sense I have before propounded, the *Reason* in these words is plain, *viz.* thus, *For, for this cause*, viz. *that they might be judged according to men in the flesh*, i. e. that they might pass a severe Judgement upon themselves, and mortifie all their sinful lusts, *but live according to God in the spirit*, i. e. live new and holy lives, *was the Gospel preached to those that are dead.* Here you may observe a clear Antithesis in the words; *being judged* or condemned is opposed to *living*, and *flesh* to *spirit*, and *according to men*, to *according to God. For this cause the Gospel was preach'd to them that are dead in sin, viz.* that being once Converted they may judge and condemn themselves, and mortifie the flesh, and die to sin, (as Judging and passing Sentence are in order to Execution and

put-

putting to Death among men, or *according to men*) but be *Alive to the ſpirit*, and walk according to Gods holy laws. So then theſe two places mutually explain each other: *the dead to whom the Goſpel was preached* are the ſame with the *ſpirits in priſon*, to whom *Chriſt went and preach'd*. In both places are meant the *Spiritually dead*, thoſe that are under the power and dominion of their ſins.

Thus I hope I have fully ſhew'd who are *the ſpirits in priſon*. Now it remains that I explain how *Chriſt went and preached* to theſe ſpirits. The Preaching here is not Chriſts Perſonal Preaching, but his preaching by his Apoſtles, after his Reſurrection, yea his Aſcenſion, at which time he ſent his *Holy Spirit* to them, by which they were enabled to preach the Goſpel to *Jews* and *Gentiles*. *By which ſpirit* (for [ἐν ᾧ] is as much as [δι' ὃ]) poured forth on his Apoſtles he *preached*, i. e. he cauſed them to preach to the Unconverted world, Jews and Gentiles, who were yet in their ſins. It is rightly ſaid that *He preached*, becauſe what was done by the Apoſtles, Chriſts Miniſters, is ſaid to be done by Chriſt himſelf. And this which is here inſerted, [*he went*,] though

it

it is thought by Dr *Hammond* to be a mere Expletive, yet it is not ſo, but hath its particular weight and import. Theſe two things, I conceive are ſuggeſted to us by it, 1. the Deputation of his Apoſtles. Chriſt *went* not in his own perſon, but he may be truly ſaid to have *gone* by his *Delegates* and *Miniſters*. *Theſe went*, and that from place to place to preach the Goſpel. I look upon *Eph.* 2. 17. to be a parallel Text with this which I am inſiſting on. *He came* (or, *he went*) *and preached peace to you who were afar off, viz.* to the *Epheſians* who were Gentiles and Idolaters. He *came* not to theſe in perſon, but he *came*, or *went* by thoſe whom he ſent to preach to them. Thus *he went, and preached to theſe ſpirits in priſon.* So more ſignally he went to the *Jews*, yea to them indeed firſt, as St *Peter* ſpeaks, Acts 3. 26. *Unto you firſt, God having raiſed up his ſon Jeſus, ſent him to bleſs you.* God *ſent him* after his Aſcenſion, not him in perſon, but Others in his name to preach repentance, to *turn every one of them from their iniquities*, as it follows in that place. Thus Chriſt *went*: he *ſent* thoſe who went. 2. This ſpeaks the *Freeneſs of the act*. Neither Chriſt nor

nor his Apostles staied till the *Gentiles* and *Jews* sought for the Gospel, and Salvation by it, but they *went* to them, they freely offer'd these to them. The word then is not redundant and superfluous, but very Pregnant and Emphatical. God offers his grace freely, God the Father *sends*, God the Son *goes*. With what Courtship and Unparallel'd Address did he seek and woe the love of Sinners whilst he was here on earth? With what Concernedness and Passion did he beseech and sollicit the degenerate race of mankind? And when he left this world and went to his *Father*, behold, he sent his *Spirit* to actuate his Church, especially his Apostles, whom he appointed to instruct and convert souls throughout the whole world. He inspired them with extraordinary Gifts and Graces, to make them able to discharge their office. And accordingly they did discharge it with great power and vigour, with marvellous and unexpected success. They *preached to the spirits in prison*, and that so effectually that they *set them free from their Imprisonment*.

But here it will be Objected, what is this to the purpose? what reason have you to assert that These words speak

of

of Christs preaching by his Apostles to the Unbelievers, both Jews and Gentiles, in those times, when as the Text plainly refers to the days of the Old World only, for the *preaching to the spirits in prison*, is said to have been *when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing*: How then can this belong to the times of the *Apostles*, and their preaching to unbelieving *Jews* and *Gentiles*? To solve this, I have told you already that the words do not *altogether* refer to those *Antediluvian* Transgressors, but in a Latitude and by way of Analogy they comprehend all that have *sometime been disobedient*. But because what the Learned *Episcopius* hath offer'd, *viz.* that the several generations of the Wicked are look'd upon as One Body of men, and in this Large consideration the Preaching to those who lived in the days of *Noah* may reach even to them in the *Apostles* times, because (I say) this may seem Unsatisfactory, I will offer That which will abundantly satisfie all persons. It is this, that in these words there is an *Ellipsis*, which is a Figure that is commonly made use of in the Scripture, and therefore it ought not to seem strange in this

place.

place. That this *Ellipsis* or *Leaving out of a word* is very frequent, you may satisfie yourselves from those Writers who have made it their business to treat of the Stile and Phraseology of the Bible: they will let you see at one view what a number of *Defective speeches* there are in the Holy Writ. So it is here; and there being a Defect, a Supplement must be made. And what is that? The Greek word ὡς, or καθὼς, or ὥσπερ is to be inserted before the word ὅτε; and the words are to be read thus, *By which he went and preach'd to the spirits in prison who were sometime disobedient, as when once the long-suffring, or patience of God waited in the days of Noah.* This word [as] which is a note of Similitude or Comparison, being left out in the *Greek*, ought to be supplied in the *Translation*. That it ought to be so, to make the sense entire, will appear by setting before you some places of Scripture. (for I will not trouble you with instances of the Ellipsis of this particle in Prophane Writers, though I could produce very many) where this word is left out in the Original, but is supplied by the Translators. As in *Gen.* 16. 12. *Pagnine* inserts *tanquam*, and reads it thus,

He

He will be as a wild man. In *Psal.* 11. 1. the Septuagint add ὡς, and the vulgar Latin *sicut*, and our English Translators [*as,*] and read the words thus, *Flie as a bird to your mountain*, notwithstanding that Adverb is not in the Hebrew. In *Psal.* 12. 6. our Translators thought it requisite to supply the sense with an [*as,*] though this particle be not in the Original: for thus they render the place, *The words of the Lord are pure words, as silver tried in a furnace*, &c. In *Ps.* 22. 13. *as* is Prefixed by the Seventy, and *sicut* by the Vulgar Latin, and *ut* by *Pagnine*, and *as* by our Translators, [*as a ravening and a roaring Lion,*] but the Note of Comparison is omitted in the Hebrew. So in those words, *My tongue is the pen of a ready writer*, [*as*] is implied; wherefore in *Pagnine's* Interlineary Version [*ut*] is added in the margent, to compleat the sense. I might mention *Gen.* 49. 9. *Judah is a lions whelp*, where [*as*] ought to be inserted. So in *Cant.* 1. 15. & 4. 1. *thy eyes are doves*, (for so it is according to the *Hebrew*,) the meaning without doubt is [*as doves,*] *viz.* as doves eyes. Likewise in *Jon.* 1. 11. this word is left out, for כמו is supposed to answer

anſwer to ὥσπερ, although this latter be not expreſſed by the Inſpired Writer. Laſtly, (to name no more, though ſeveral other places might be produced) the omiſſion of ὥσπερ in 2 *Pet.* 3. 4. is moſt palpable, and therefore there is a ſupply made by our Tranſlators, *All things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation*, as if the Greek were ὥσπερ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως, whereas it is barely ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως. You ſee then that it hath been thought neceſſary to add this word in ſeveral places of Holy Scripture. The ſame neceſſity is in the Text which is before us at preſent. This word [*as*] being inſerted, makes the ſenſe Clear and Manifeſt; for this plainly ſhews that there is a *Compariſon* here between what was done in the *Apoſtles* days, and what happened in the days of *Noah*. The Long-ſuffering of God in the times of the Apoſtles, was *like* that in *Noah*'s age. As Chriſt the Eternal Wiſdom preached by *Noah* to thoſe who were *diſobedient* before the Floud, ſo he did by the *Apoſtles* to thoſe who were *ſuch* in their times. As God heretofore ſhew'd an extraordinary Patience and Mercy towards the people of the Old World, giving them a ſufficient ſpace

to

to Repent in, no leſs then 120 years, which yet was not Improved by them; only a few, hearkning to Gods Voice, were deliver'd and ſaved by the Ark: So Chriſt was pleaſed to give proof of his Singular Long-ſuffering and Kindneſs towards the diſobedient Jews and Gentiles, who lived in the days of the Apoſtles: he by theſe his Meſſengers offered grace to thoſe profligate ſinners, ſhut up and conſign'd as 'twere to Execution and Deſtruction: yet he went and preached the Goſpel to them, and freely tender'd the happy fruits of his Redemption. But the greateſt part of them evilly requited his Kindneſs, they continued in their Unbelief and Impenitence: only there was a ſelect number among them which accepted of the divine favour and mercy, and was ſaved. Thus the *Similitude* or *Compariſon* runs. This word [*as*] being added to the Text, the ſenſe is obvious and evident, which otherwiſe was very obſcure and uncertain, notwithſtanding what the forementioned Expoſitors had ſaid of it. The Text for want of inſerting this *Note of Similitude* hath led men to ſeveral fond Conjectures and Miſtakes (as you have heard;) but now it is very Clear, and we have not made

made it ſubſervient to any Improbable and Abſurd Opinions.

This then we are obliged to take notice of in a ſpecial manner, *viz.* how *Theſe two are Alike*, the Preaching of *Chriſt* or the *Apoſtles* to the unbelievers of that time, and the Preaching of *Noah* to the people of the Old World. The *Likeneſs* is mention'd in a General way here: but (to illuſtrate the words) let us take a view of the Particulars of it. 1. Here is a parallel between *Him* that preach'd to thoſe before the Floud, and *Him* that preach'd to the Heathens and Jews under the Goſpel. Or rather indeed this is One and the ſame Perſon, *Chriſt*, the eſſential Wiſdom of the Father, *God bleſſed for evermore.* This is He that *preached* to the men of All Ages. As he ſpake to the people in *Noahs* time, ſo he did the ſame *afterwards*, and he ſpake to the Unbelievers of the *Laſt days*, *Jeſus Chriſt*, *the ſame yeſterday, to day, and for ever.* 2. He ſpoke to both *by the ſpirit. By this he went and preached* to them, and *by this* (even his *Eternal Spirit*) he hath preach'd to all generations of men ever ſince the world was. But 3^ly, this was not an *Immediate*

Preaching, for as the Son of God made uſe of *Noah* and his ſons to admoniſh the ſinners before the Deluge, ſo he ſtirr'd up the *Diſciples* and *Apoſtles* to preach to the Jews and Gentiles in the primitive times of Chriſtianity. 4. Here is a Compariſon between the *Hearers* as well as the *Preachers*. As the greateſt part of the men of the Old World were *diſobedient* to *Noahs* preaching, ſo moſt of the Jews and Heathens were *diſobedient* to the preaching of the Apoſtles. Yet again, as ſome of the *Antediluvians* were *obedient* to the Spirit and *Noahs* preaching, ſo ſome of the Others *believed* and *were converted* when the Apoſtles were ſent to them. 5. The Parallel is obſervable as to the *Effect*, or rather the *Conſequence* of both Preachings: ſome Periſhed, others were Saved. The Impenitent and Hardned ſinners periſhed in the water, but the family of *Noah* was by the ſingular mercy of Heaven reſcued from deſtruction. 6ly, Therefore the Compariſon is too evident in the *Paucity* of the perſons ſaved on both ſides. This you find particularly taken notice of. As in *Noahs* days *few, that is eight ſouls were ſaved*, ſo when Chriſt came

and

and preached by his Apoſtles and Miniſters, thoſe that believed were but a very ſmall number: *a remnant ſhall be ſaved*, Rom. 9. 27. 7ly, and laſtly, Obſerve the Analogy between the *Ark* and *Baptiſm*, which were the ſignal attendants of *Chriſts Preaching*, the one in *Noahs*, the other in the *Apoſtles* days. This being particularly mention'd here, I will explain what the Apoſtle means by it. *In the Ark*, ſaith he, *eight ſouls were ſaved by water*: that is, they were preſerved and delivered out of the water of the Deluge: for *ſaving by water*, is as much as *ſaving out of the water*: as *ſaving by fire*, (1 Cor. 3. 15.) is *ſaving out of the fire*. Or thus, *ſaved by water*, may be all one with *being ſaved by means of the water, viz.* by the waves lifting up the Ark, and carrying it aloft, and ſo ſaving them from being overwhelmed. The waters of the floud bore up the Ark, and thereby kept the perſons in it from drowning. *The like figure* (or Antitype) *whereunto, even Baptiſm, doth alſo now ſave us*, v. 21, That is, the holy Ordinance of Baptiſm *reſembleth* the Ark in the Floud: for as This was the happy means of *ſaving Noah* and his

family, ſo That was appointed by Chriſt under the Goſpel to be the bleſſed inſtrument of Salvation. Unleſs you will take the word ἀντιτυπος here for a *Contrary Figure* (as it ſignifies ſometimes, according to the different rendring of ἀντὶ,) and then the ſenſe is, that *Saving* is now *by water*, as heretofore it was by *eſcaping it*. The Water of Baptiſm is now the means of our Safety, as of old the water of the Deluge was the means of Deſtruction. Thus the *Compariſon* holds good in all theſe particulars. It was without doubt deſign'd that one ſhould be a *Repreſentation* of the other. I had reaſon therefore to inſert the Note of Similitude [*as*,] to give you the true meaning of the words. And you ſee there was *ground* for inſerting it, there being ſeveral Examples of the like nature in the Holy Scriptures.

Now then let us read the words, *Chriſt hath once ſuffer'd for ſins, being put to death in the fleſh, but quickned by the Spirit, by which alſo he went and preach'd unto the ſpirits in priſon: who ſometime were diſobedient, as when once the long-ſuffering of God waited in the days of Noah,*

Noah, while the Ark was preparing, wherein few, that is eight ſouls, were ſaved by water. The like figure whereunto, even Baptiſm, doth alſo now ſave us. The plain meaning of all which is This, that Chriſt after his Crucifixion was raiſed from the dead by the Spirit of God, and by the ſame Spirit communicated to the Apoſtles he preached the Goſpel to the ſtubborn Jews and the Idolatrous Gentiles. And upon this preaching to them, moſt of thoſe poor wretches who were *Shut up* in darkneſs and ignorance, who were *Impriſoned* by Satan, and *Bound with the chain of their ſins*, remain'd ſtill in the ſame miſerable condition, rejecting the Goſpel, and in that were like unto the *diſobedient* ſinners in *Noahs* days, who refuſed the preaching of *Noah*, and of the Spirit by him. But as there were ſome, though *a few*, in that age who attended to that *Preacher of righteouſneſs*, and found favour with God, ſo was it likewiſe in the times of the *Apoſtles Preaching*, a ſmall company (that is, *Small* in reſpect of thoſe who refuſed the tenders of Salvation, but otherwiſe very *Great* and *Numerous*) were ſo effectually wrought upon that they

believed in *Jesus*, and forsook their sins, being washed from them by the waters of *Baptism*, which was prefigured by *Noahs Ark*. This is that which the words present us with, and it is no other then the *Great Mystery of Godliness* (as it is set forth in 1 *Tim.* 3. 16.) *God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world.* This is the substance of the words which I have been treating of, this is the High and Noble Theme which St *Peter* here briefly handleth. Though the Generality of men (both then and since) refuse the offers of Grace and Mercy in Christ Jesus, yet the Preaching of the Gospel is not ineffectual and successless: both in those first ages of the world, and in these of late, there have continually been *added unto the Church such as shall be Saved.* But because the *Old World* was the Greatest Example and Instance of Gods Long-suffering, as well as of the Impenitence and Refractorines of sinners, therefore Gods sparing the *Jews* and *Gentiles* afterwards, and sending the Apostles to Preach the Gospel to them, are very fitly parallel'd with the *Preaching of Noah*,

and

and *Gods Long-suffering* towards the people of *that time*: The Apostle here, to give a *Remarkable Instance* of Gods Patience, chooses out the *days of Noah*, a most Polluted and Degenerate Age, as you will find it decipher'd in *Gen.* 6. Hence among the *Rabbins*, *the Age of the Floud* is used to express the most Wicked and Prophane generation of men: for of all sinners those *Antediluvians* are reckoned to be the Worst and Vilest. It is like the *Age of the Giants*, noted among the *Pagans*, especially their Poets. For this reason St *Peter* particularly mentions That Age, and makes the *Preaching of Noah* to them to be a Figure and Representation of *Christ and his Apostles Preaching* to the sinners of their time. They that in these days were *disobedient* and believed not the Gospel, whilst the Christian Church was building up, are represented by Those Sinners of old who believ'd not, whilst the Ark was building. And so likewise, Those that *believed* in the Apostles times, and were saved by *Baptism*, were prefigured by those who in *Noahs* days were saved in the *Ark* by water. Yea, I am bold to say, that *Noahs* Preaching to the sinners of

of that first age, is a figure of the Preaching of the Gospel even to the end of the world: which was intimated by [y] *Augustin*, who tells us, that the Age of *Noah* was a Type of the Ages to come. Let *Us* then, on whom the ends of the world are come, think our selves concern'd here. *The Long-suffering of God hath waited* in Our days, calling us to repentance and Amendment of life. O that we may not abuse this Patience of the Almighty, but that we may before it is too late, attend to the Preaching of Christ by his Holy Ministers, and by his Sacred Spirit in our hearts, and that we may be willing to *come out of prison*, to leave our sins, in which we have been Fetter'd, to be set Free, and to be Saved.

[y] *Epist.* 99. *ad Euodium.*

Thus I have finished the task I undertook, which was to explain this Obscure Text. I know there are *Other Solutions* of the words, but I cannot think that they will be of any weight with Intelligent Readers. Some will read πνεύμαλι in stead of πνεύμασι, and thereby alter the sense, but this is against all the *Greek Copies* and the *Syriack*. Others tell us there is an *Hyperbaton* in

in the words, that the Grammatical Order of them is transposed, and thence they proceed to point them after another manner, and then to raise a New Sense: but this is generally exploded. A late [a] Author from *Geneva* would have the words read thus, *He went and preached with the spirits in prison*: Christ went with the Angels, those Good Spirits *&c.* and thence he frames a very odd interpretation of the Text. But these and some *others* I have forborn to trouble you with, because I believe you would look upon them as very extravagant. If any one shall entertain the same thought of that Exposition which I have offered, I shall not be offended, on condition he will shew me good reason for his thinking so. Otherwise I shall not attend to what he saith, but shall be the more confirmed in the Sense of the words which I have offered. In brief, I have rejected the Wild Comments and *Gemara's* which have been made on this Text, and I have seriously applied my self to the giving you the True and Uncorrupted Meaning of the words, *i. e.* to shew you who these *spirits in prison* are. I have, I hope, let in some Light

[a] David Cleric. Quæst. Sacr.

to them, yea I have Opened their Prison-doors which were so fast lock'd up by the several Mistaken Glosses on these words. But in this, as in the Other Expositions of Scripture which I have tendred, I am always ready to submit to those who are of more Sagacious Judgments.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAg. 21. line 9. read *καιμοπόλοις*. p. 61. l. 27. r. *lost* p. 67. l. 9. r. *deviations*. p. 72. l. 21. dele τὸ. p. 75. against l. 12 add in the Margin, *de Pallio*. p 76. l. 21. dele *the*. p. 81. l. 9. r. *Cynick*. p. 94. l. 23. r. *curl*.